

378.7 P41c

Cheyney \$4.00
History of the
University of Penn-
sylvania. Nu '40
c. No. 1026313

378.7 P41c

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

A standard linear barcode is positioned horizontally across the bottom of the page. It is composed of vertical black lines of varying widths on a white background. The barcode is oriented vertically along the right edge of the page.

282

1325

10

92a

JA' 27'41

OCT 10 '49 - 102

History of the
UNIVERSITY *of* PENNSYLVANIA

*Ask Counsel of both Times; of the Ancient Time,
what is best, and of the Latter Time, what is fittest. Re-
form, therefore, without Bravery or Scandal of Former
Times and Persons, but yet set it down to thyself as
well to create good Precedents as to follow Them.*

—BACON

History of the
UNIVERSITY *of* PENNSYLVANIA

1740 - 1940

By

Edward Potts Cheyney



UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

Philadelphia

1940

Copyright 1940
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
Manufactured in the United States of America

London
Humphrey Milford
Oxford University Press

378.7
P41c

28n.400

1026313

No 23 30

To the
ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY
*who along with the Trustees, the Faculty,
the Administrative Officers and the Students
are the University*
this book is affectionately dedicated

PREFACE

IN writing this book Dr. E. W. Mumford, Secretary of the University, has given me invaluable assistance at every turn and I find it difficult to express adequately my sense of obligation and gratitude to him. I can only say that without his advice and help, generously offered and unsparingly given, I would not have begun and could not have finished the book. Other officers of the University and of the alumni societies, especially Dean Pepper, Mr. George E. Nitzsche, Recorder, Mr. C. S. Thompson, Librarian, Mr. C. J. Miel, Manager of the University Fund and Mr. Horace M. Lippincott, Editor of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* and *General Magazine* have offered and given me much help.

Colleagues in the Faculty, some of them now in retirement, responded promptly, fully, and thoughtfully to my questions about their respective departments. I collected in this way much information that it has proved impossible, unfortunately, to include in this book. I hope they will not be disappointed. Limitations of space soon asserted themselves and it became evident that a single volume could include little more than an account of the establishment and early circumstances of departments that have had a long and interesting history, and a mere mention rather than a full discussion of much that was significant. Limitations of time stood equally in the way. The two years or somewhat more that have been given to the preparation of the history did not give time to gain familiarity with such a complex body as the University has come to be, beyond the vague knowledge gained by one who has grown up with it. The volume entitled *The University of Pennsylvania Today* provides a partial corrective to these deficiencies, and contains much material I have with a heavy heart laid aside.

This inadequacy is especially true of the Medical School and its allied interests. They have proved to be too extensive and varied to be included in any other way than as part of the general stream of University history. Yet there have been periods when

the Medical School was the largest and best-known part of the University, and its whole history is one of extreme interest quite apart from its University connection. Notwithstanding the answers Dean Pepper gave to my specific questions, it became evident, as I have pointed out in the text, that the Medical School needs and deserves a volume of its own. This lack is partially filled for the early period by the publication of Dr. Joseph Carson's *History of the Medical Department of the University of Pennsylvania, from its Foundation in 1765* (Phila., 1869), and by F. R. Packard's, *History of Medicine in the United States* (2 vols. N.Y. 1931), especially Volume I, chapter 3. "The Earliest Medical Schools." But the former is antiquated and at best only comes down to 1830, while Packard deals with Pennsylvania only as one, even if the first of American medical schools. There is abundance of material to hand for a valuable and interesting history of the Medical School.

Other departments also have had an active and separate life that should be chronicled. Some have been partially though not adequately recorded, as *The Wharton School: Its First Fifty Years, 1881-1931*, and the excellent *History of the School of Veterinary Medicine, 1884-1934*, compiled by the Faculty of that School. There are histories of some other departments published on similar memorial occasions.

As indicated in the last few pages of the book I have not undertaken to include the history of what are called extra-curricular activities. Not only is their record an obscure one, but each has followed a course apart from the general progress of University history. Each should have a written history of its own. Athletics have awakened so much interest and been so closely connected with the popularity of the University that it is only the difficulty of bringing their history into compact form that has justified including so little about them. A history of athletics at Pennsylvania is to be published in the near future.

As to the original sources from which this narrative is drawn, they are so multifarious that only a few of the more obvious can be mentioned. The minutes of the Board of Trustees are complete from 1749 to date, in the office of the Secretary. In his office are also the earlier minute books of the College and of other de-

partments, except those of the Medical School, which are in the office of that department. There are also many committee reports and other varied material in the "Archives" in the care of the Secretary. In the Library are thirteen volumes of "University Papers," mostly official documents of the first century of the University's life; various sets of scrapbooks, such as the twelve volumes collected by John C. Sims, four volumes of the records of the class of 1887, sets of periodicals, and a great number of bound pamphlets concerning various episodes in University history. There is much also in the Dr. E. F. Smith Memorial Library, useful for the history of the University, as well as concerning its special interest, the history of chemistry. The early newspapers are full of references to the College, and there are numberless scattered sources of information. The printed and manuscript material used in the preparation of this volume and all other known references to the history of the University have been listed, and this list will be preserved in the University Library in accessible form for the use of subsequent investigators.

As to histories of the University already written, they are few and inadequate, or this volume would not need to have been undertaken. The best, though unfortunately it covers scarcely more than twenty years of the two hundred, is *A History of the University of Pennsylvania from Its Foundation to A.D. 1770*, by Thomas Harrison Montgomery (Philadelphia, 1900). It closes with the following words, "Here the Author lays down his pen, hoping, however, that another may carry on the History of this University Family, illustrating its varying misfortunes during the Revolutionary struggle, its quiet life through the first seventy years of this century, and portraying with loving strokes its enlarged and influential work of the present generation, under the strong stimulus of which it is prepared to enter upon its great career in the Twentieth Century." There could be no higher aspiration for this book than that it should in some degree fulfil the hope expressed by Mr. Montgomery.

A History of the University of Pennsylvania from the Beginning to the Year 1827, by Dr. George B. Wood, was in its original form an address given before the Philomathean Society, June 1827, and before the Council of the Pennsylvania Historical So-

ciety on October 29 of the same year. It was, after being much expanded, published in Philadelphia in 1834. It is a good account but of course drawn from very insufficient sources. *The University of Pennsylvania, Franklin's College*, by Horace M. Lippincott (Phila. 1919), is an intimate account laying stress on the social interests and famous personages connected with the University, especially with the College. Charles W. Dulles, *The Charity School of 1740*, has gathered much of the scattered information about that neglected dependency of the University. Francis N. Thorpe, *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania* (Washington, 1893) contains sketches of the history of the different departments of the University up to the date of its publication.

A number of books, largely devoted to illustrations of the University, contain considerable textual material concerning its history. The fullest of these, also accompanied with many biographies, is in the series *Universities and their Sons*, edited by Joshua L. Chamberlain; *University of Pennsylvania*, 2 vols., Historical Editor, Edward P. Cheyney, Biographical Editor, Ellis P. Oberholtzer (Boston, 1901). One of the most informative of histories of this type is *The University of Pennsylvania, Its History, Traditions, etc.*, by George E. Nitzsche, numerous editions. Others are by Weygandt and McKeehan, by J. H. Penniman, and by J. B. McMaster.

In writing this history of the University I have endeavored constantly to consider its periodic character, the fact that it is intended to be a history of the two hundred years from its foundation to the year 1940. But the effort has been unsuccessful. I cannot think of the history of the University as coming to a close. The University is a running stream; it will not stop to be summed up or treated as a completed whole. The words "The End" may be written on the last page of the volume, but it is only this narrative, not the history of the University, that comes to a close; almost before this book is printed the University will already have started on its third century.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY

April 1940

CONTENTS

Preface	<i>Page</i> vii
BOOK I: EARLY TIMES: 1740-1779	
<i>Chapter</i>	
1. The City	3
2. The Foundation: 1740-1755	17
3. The Colonial College: 1755-1779	53
BOOK II: THE MIDDLE PERIOD: 1779-1829	
4. Division and Reunion	129
5. Low Water: 1791-1828	176
BOOK III: THE RENAISSANCE: 1829-1881	
6. The Beginning of Expansion	219
7. The Move to West Philadelphia	257
BOOK IV: MODERN TIMES: 1881-1940	
8. The Era of Expansion	285
9. Provost, Trustees, and Alumni	360
10. Under a President: 1930-1940	414
Principal Officers	435
Index	437

Book I

EARLY TIMES

1740-1779



Chapter x

THE CITY

PHILADELPHIA in the middle of the eighteenth century had become, by colonial standards, a large and rich city. A careful count of houses in 1749 indicated that it possessed a population of about twelve thousand. This was increasing rapidly. Week by week, often day by day, vessels came up the river bringing immigrants from Europe and passengers from other American settlements. Some of these only passed through the city on their way to the farming regions; but, as in all cases when a city is once established, there was a steady reflux from the country into the town. Individuals, like young Franklin in 1723, came to Philadelphia overland or by river boat or sailing vessel to make their fortunes. Of the men who were prominent in the city in the middle of the eighteenth century, a striking number had come since its opening. They came from the southern colonies, New England, and the West Indies, as well as from England, Scotland, and Ireland. They were a second wave of "first settlers," presumably attracted not so much by the religious freedom of Penn's colony as by its industrial success and opportunities. A somewhat careful estimate made in 1760 gives the city's population as eighteen thousand. It was the largest as well as the most rapidly growing American city. Far from being the "green country town" of Penn's vision, extending along wide streets between its two rivers, "each purchaser having room enough for a house, garden and small orchard," it had already become, under the influence of commerce, a compact, even a congested city. It stretched some two miles in a narrow strip along the Delaware; on the river front, looking out across the harbor, were the oldest dwelling houses, interspersed with warehouses, sail lofts, shipyards, and

taverns. Back of them lay a narrow checkerboard of a dozen or more main streets intersected with numerous and irregularly spaced alleys and courts. All of it, practically, lay east of the present Sixth Street. Built partly of wood, but principally of the fine red brick into which the local clay bakes, Philadelphia was already the "Red City" its great physician and novelist has called it when picturing it as it was half a century later.¹

There were a few fine mansions surrounded by large grounds, the Carpenter house, the Shippen house, the Loxley house, Clark's Hall, and others, but for the most part dwellings were scattered along the streets and alleys or stood contiguously in solid rows. Many merchants and professional men, even of those who were well-to-do, lived in the houses in which they carried on their affairs, some still on the water front, others along the five or six streets parallel with the river, or those extending back toward the open country and the Schuylkill. The edges of the city were frayed out into a region where handsome country places of families that sought open space, like Stenton, alternated with disreputable taverns and shabby houses such as always border main roads running out from a town.

In this city lived an unusually mixed population. Its foundation was of course the body of English families, mostly middle class, some of them Quakers, some Church people, some Dissenters, who, attracted by the offer of religious and civil freedom and reports of excellent and cheap land, had come over with William Penn or in the first twenty years of the colony's existence. Remnants of Swedes and Dutch from the early settlements on the Delaware, a few French and Spanish immigrants, and a steadily flowing stream of Germans and Scotch-Irish percolated among the main body of English settlers.

As a meeting place of North and South and a place where African slaves, acclimated in the West Indies and the far South, were constantly being imported and bought and sold, the city held many Negroes, slave and free. At the funeral of the famous Quaker opponent of slavery and the slave trade, Anthony Benezet, said to have been the largest known in the city's history, one-

¹ See the contemporary map in the Philadelphia Library and Dr. S. Weir Mitchell's *The Red City*, N.Y., 1908.

third of the followers in the procession, walking in the rear, were Negroes.

As a city of proclaimed freedom of religion, it had a population as various in religious profession as in national origin. By the middle of the century there were congregations of the Church of England, Quakers, Presbyterians, Baptists, Moravians, Lutherans, German and Dutch Reformed, and Roman Catholics, besides many people not included in these or any other religious folds. Indeed profession of "the Pennsylvania religion" was said to be a jocular claim made by a person who had no religious connection.

Philadelphia was, as has been observed, a rich city. It was possible by wholesale or retail trade to change a small business rapidly into a large one. A competence was easy, wealth not too difficult to obtain. There were already several well-established wealthy merchant families. Exportation of products of the back country, grain, flour, ship-bread, flax and flaxseed, bar and pig iron, skins and furs, and importation of necessities and luxuries from the mother country, from other continental colonies and from the West Indies, not to mention occasional privateering, gave abundant opportunity for merchants to increase the extent of their operations and to amass considerable fortunes. In October 1752 there were 117 seagoing vessels, most of them doubtless very small according to modern standards, lying in the harbor at one time. The imports for that year, about two-thirds of them from England, were valued at more than £600,000. Ships were built, sold, and put into service for freight and as packets; tanneries, breweries, and bake-houses of ship-bread are shown on the maps of the river front and the lower reach of Dock Creek.¹

With the rapid increase of population there was also much demand for city lots and adjacent country land, and in the consequent rapid exchanges of ownership, early comers and those in a position to speculate in land profited by the unearned increment. After about 1730 the iron furnaces and forges along the upper Schuylkill became a source of wealth. The ironmasters were interested also in the city. Families in the upper classes were small, notwithstanding Franklin's assertion to the contrary, and

¹ Nicholas Scull's plan and statistics, pub. 1762.

there was much intermarriage among them, so that fortunes were often combined. Professional men, the doctors and lawyers, collected good fees; the former increased their incomes by dispensing their own medicines, the latter by payment for drawing up that multitude of legal documents, examples of which still lie abundantly in the desks of old Philadelphia families and in the cases of historical libraries. Offices under the Proprietors and the city and provincial governments had by this time become lucrative. Contractors profiteered when there was opportunity. The wealthy were constantly obtaining new recruits. Franklin, who entered the city as a boy and penniless in 1723, had become rich enough to retire from business only nineteen years later; and the personal records of the time offer many other instances of rapid rise to wealth, although seldom from so modest a start.

Below the group which possessed most of this wealth, with of course many variations, was a large class of small merchants and artisans. Those who worked for others received reasonably good and regular wages. Those who worked for themselves often prospered—judging from their contributions to churches, lodges, charities, and a variety of causes in which they were interested, and from their wills. A typical will of a man who describes himself as “carpenter” bequeaths pieces of land in the city, in New Jersey, and in Lancaster County, his tools and some books of his trade, his Negro woman Judith, and his man William Skelton.¹ It is to be remembered, however, that the carpenters of this period were also builders, and men of this calling made up the Carpenters Company and built Carpenter’s Hall of Revolutionary fame.

Between the wealthy who had become established and this middle class there was a wide social distinction. There was little possibility of mechanics or small retail dealers rising to a higher social class. The lines between the upper and the middle and lower classes were more sharply drawn than in later times. The mercantile, professional, landed, and office-holding class were on one side of this line, the common people, the small tradesmen, and artisans on the other. The former class were an aristocracy, though not a landed one. Low-born men, if able, were recog-

¹ Will of Edmund Wooley, Carpenter, dated 1780.

nized but hardly accepted within its circle. Franklin, though he became wealthy, eminent, and influential, was never quite considered, nor did he consider himself, a member of the upper class in Philadelphia. For example, in his *Plain Truth*, written in 1747 to urge defense against the French and the Indians, he says he speaks for the "Middling People, the Farmers, Shopkeepers and Tradesmen of the City and Country," and fulminates against "those great and rich men, merchants and others, who are ever railing at Quakers for doing what their principles seem to require—but take not one step for the Publick Safety." He not infrequently uses a bitter or sarcastic tone toward those he describes as "Men of Wealth and Influence."

There was much poverty in the city. The overseers of the poor were always busy; and we hear of widespread suffering and of special collections being made when there was an unusually hard winter. There was much disorder. The restless elements were recruited principally from redemptioners who had left their service and seamen deserting their ships, dissatisfied apprentices, and the usual flotsam and jetsam of a port town in those days of drunkenness and neglect. The authorities had constant trouble with misdeeds in obscure taverns and during fair time. The presentment of a grand jury in 1744 calls the attention of the mayor and magistrates to the fact that there are more than one hundred taverns in the city, and that many of these are mere "tippling houses," tending to vice and debauchery and the increase of poverty. "They impoverish the neighborhoods they live in and for want of better customers are under temptation to entertain apprentices, servants and even negroes." One of these neighborhoods is "so vitiated that it has obtained among the common People the shocking name of 'Hell Town.'" The jury proceeds to present, as keeping disorderly houses, six women and three men. Yet eight years later, in 1752, there were still in the city 120 taverns with licenses, and 118 houses that sold rum by the quart.¹

Taverns were of course by no means all disorderly houses: quite the contrary. The Indian King on Market Street near Third, where Franklin's Junto held its meetings, the Crooked

¹ *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXII, 497-99.

Billet on the wharf above Chestnut, the Conestoga Wagon, where German farmers put up, the Pewter Platter at the corner of Front Street and an alley that took its name from the tavern, Mullen's, where the Freemasons met, the Beef-steak Club dined, and the Governor entertained his guests, Mrs. Roberts' Coffee House, the London Tavern of a later date, and many others were respectable and indeed famous.

Crimes and misdemeanors were numerous and punishments were harsh. In 1729 Charles Callaghan was convicted of intent to ravish a child of ten years and was whipped around the town at the cart's tail and then given thirty-five lashes, and the next year two culprits were for a similar offense placed for an hour in the pillory, then whipped. The same year a man received twenty-one lashes for stealing a saddle. At one Quarter Sessions Court, in 1733, thirteen men and women were convicted of stealing and were sentenced to be whipped. In 1750 and 1751 there was a regular epidemic of house-breaking, horse-stealing and counterfeiting, and there were many hangings. In 1761 there was a scandal when several young men, sons of the best families, slipped away from their homes, slept in the daytime in a certain tavern at Fourth and Chestnut streets, and sallied forth at night to break doorknobs, slash dresses and petticoats with razors, and otherwise insult women on the street, and do other serious mischief. When their identity was discovered they were taken before the mayor, who lectured them, then dismissed them on bail after their relatives and friends had given bonds for their good behavior and made restitution for the losses they had inflicted.

Slaves were regularly sent to the Court House at Second and Market streets by their owners to be whipped for their misdemeanors. Not only petty offenses but serious crimes occurred among them: in 1738 three Negroes were hung for a multiple poisoning. In 1743 a Negro, brought to the whipping post to be whipped, took out his knife and cut his throat, dying before the crowd.¹ But too dark a picture must not be drawn; such occurrences were, as in all the annals of crime, exceptional.

An early local poet wrote, doubtless with only the usual poetic license:

¹ John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia*. Ed. 1856, I, 309-10.

Hail Pennsylvania! Hail, thou happy land
Where plenty scatters with a lavish hand,

Where free from clouds we breathe aetherial air,
And Sol keeps holiday throughout the year.
Thy sons are witty and thy daughters fair.¹

Our interest, moreover, in this history lies with the upper, not the lower or the criminal classes. It was among them that the College was to arise and flourish. In the hands of the upper class lay the government of the city and the province, in so far as it was not controlled by the distant Proprietor or his representative the Governor, or by the still more shadowy and occasional interference of the British Crown and Parliament. William Penn's grant of rights of self-government to the colony, and his charter given to the city gave the privileges and the actual work of government largely to the inhabitants. Among these it was the well-to-do merchants and professional men who made up the membership of the Provincial Council, the Assembly, the City Council and the magistracy. They were a little oligarchy of leading men. Government and social influence alike were in the hands of a caste of mercantile and professional patricians. The same names constantly meet us in the various offices, and again in the social clubs and the philanthropic organizations for which Philadelphia was already becoming famous. Local society and government were not the less an aristocracy because there was no royal court, no dominant church, and no semi-feudal body of land holders.

There are many evidences that by the middle of the century this wealthy class chose their own occupations and forms of pleasure as well as controlling politics and business. The list of subscribers to the Assembly balls, then as now a highly selective list of gentlemen, contained in 1749 the names of sixty-five men, each of whom contributed £3 currency, approximately \$10, to the expenses for the year. The ladies who made up the list of invited guests in 1757 numbered eighty-eight, mostly the wives of the men named, and the "Peggies," "Betties," "Patties,"

¹ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Nov. 21, 1728.

“Sallies,” and “Mollies” who were their daughters. The well-to-do Quakers, of whom there were many, were of course not included in this list.¹

There was little of authoritative interference with social pleasures. The Proprietors and the successive governors they appointed were no longer Quakers, and the “Friendly” impress upon manners was largely restricted to the members of the Society. There were already, as has been mentioned, regularly organized dancing assemblies. There was a “Concert Room” in Lodge Alley where these dancing assemblies took place. Several teachers gave dancing lessons, and from 1730 onward instruction was offered in performing on various musical instruments. Before the middle of the century there were organs in Christ Church and St. Peter’s, in the Roman Catholic church in Willing’s Alley, and in the newly built Moravian church. The musical interests of the Moravians, emanating from Bethlehem, were already recognizable in Philadelphia. In 1744, a visitor from Maryland not only regaled himself before breakfast by playing on his fiddle and his flute, but was invited to an evening concert given by some ladies and gentlemen. Although the great development of interest in music in Philadelphia did not come till a decade after the middle of the century and will attract our attention later, this was already evidently a city of culture and refinement.

Theatrical plays had to make their way against considerable opposition, and the middle of the century saw the question of the theatre still in doubt. In January 1749 a troupe of players had secured for the season the use of a warehouse on the river front belonging to the wealthy merchant William Plumsted who, though he had been brought up as a Quaker, had recently become a churchman and was not averse to the theatre. The Recorder and the Mayor called the attention of the City Council to this threat to the thrift and industry of persons who might attend the plays. The actors were thereupon called before the magistrates and, though not forbidden to give their performance, were bound over to good behavior. Six months later they were still playing, though nothing more demoralizing than *The Tragedy of Cato*. This troupe migrated to New York and then

¹ Watson, *op. cit.*, I, 284-85.

to Virginia, but four years later another company was allowed by Governor Hamilton, in the face of much religious protest, to give a series of twenty-four performances in the same old Water Street warehouse, its owner, Mr. Plumsted, being now mayor. There is a modern sound in the newspaper notice of April 25, 1754: "The Company of Comedians from London opened the New Theatre in Water Street, when 'The Fair Penitent' and 'Miss in her Teens' were performed before a numerous and polished audience, with unusual applause." But it was evident that city opinion was much divided. It was not until 1766 that a permanent theatre was established; even then it was built outside the city limits, as was Shakespeare's Globe on Bankside.¹

The higher intellectual interests of the city asserted themselves more and more as the century progressed. Lists of the books that were in private households, of those bequeathed, advertised and sold in the shops, and those purchased for subscription libraries are a constant source of surprise. Scarcely less striking is the number of books published in the city; though the narrowness of the provincial market necessarily affected their literary quality. Among these there were relatively few works on theology, such as appeared in New England, or even manuals of devotion, though Whitefield's *Journal* was promptly published and widely read. Yet much of the best of existing literature was available and apparently not unappreciated.

There was much solid intellectual interest. It was in 1743 that Franklin put out his plan for a general society of learned men extending through the colonies—the body that ultimately became the American Philosophical Society. He was able to name as members of a Philadelphia branch nine men each already eminent in some field of learning, and to claim that Philadelphia was not only geographically but by its intellectual activity and its possession of a learned library the natural center for such a society. His reference to the library was no doubt to the collection of James Logan, the scholarly Quaker who, while carrying on his work as a merchant and occupying in succession almost every office under the Proprietors, the province, and in the city, had collected an astonishing body of books. This he had housed

¹ A. H. Quinn, *A History of the American Drama*, N.Y., 1923, pp. 8-16.

in a building at Sixth and Walnut streets and made available to all properly introduced persons. But Franklin might well have referred to the new subscription library that he had founded ten years before, in conjunction with some of his old friends of the Junto and some new subscribers of a more wealthy class, and which, under an influential board of directors, was rapidly becoming an accepted Philadelphia institution. Of this, the "First Library in America," Logan's collection ultimately became an important part.¹

The middle years of the century were the period of a popular and growing interest in what were then called "philosophical experiments." One of the oldest possessions of the Philadelphia Library is an air pump in the use of which its members were instructed in 1739. A Dr. Greenwood gave a course of "experimental lectures" at the State House in 1740. Dr. Spence gave two courses which attracted much attention in 1744; Ebenezer Kinnersley and a Mr. Baron both gave courses in 1751. In 1753 a series of twenty experiments were performed "to show that electricity and lightning are one and the same thing." Scientific letters between Franklin and his friends enrich or encumber, according to the reader's interests, all collections of Franklin's correspondence during this period. Other men, like his friend Kinnersley, who did not, unfortunately, keep their correspondence so carefully, were fascinated with the same group of interests. A public subscription was taken up in 1742 to encourage John Bartram to make a collection of materials of natural history in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York.

It was fifty years later that Gilbert Stuart, speaking of Philadelphia at the time he lived there, called it the "Athens of America," but already in 1752 a young Englishman contrasting Philadelphia and New York had called them Athens and Sparta. It is certainly true that many such literary, scientific, musical, and dramatic societies as were found in Boston and New York only at the close of the century already existed in Philadelphia in 1750 or soon after.²

It is notable, however, that this community of such varied

¹ Austin K. Gray, *The First American Library*, Phila., 1936.

² Van Wyck Brooks, *The Flowering of New England*, N.Y., 1936.

intellectual interests and relatively abundant financial resources had as yet made no provision for higher education. There was little of such ecclesiastical demand for an education for the ministry as had led to the foundation of the New England colleges. The Episcopalians imported their clergy; the Presbyterians prepared theirs by private instruction among themselves; the Quakers and the lesser denominations, such as the Mennonites and at least some of the Baptists, were opposed to a separate and educated ministry. The higher education of laymen was not so widespread as it had been. The generation of early settlers who had brought their education with them from Europe was running out; the new arrivals were not generally so well educated, and neither were those who had been born in the province. The frontier and the regions settled by Germans were almost absolutely illiterate. Sons of the rich, especially those who were ambitious for professional success, were sometimes sent home to Europe to be educated. William Allen, perhaps the wealthiest, and one of the most influential citizens of Philadelphia and later Chief Justice of the province, had been sent to England by his father, a successful Philadelphia merchant, for a legal education; and he in turn sent three of his sons there for professional training and experience of the world, an experience that unfortunately, when the time of division came, made them Tories. William Plumsted, William Shippen, Thomas Cadwalader, and others likewise went abroad, but those who did were on the whole few. Most young people obtained their education as best they could, or as their parents could provide it for them, from local sources.

Teaching of various sorts was by no means lacking. The William Penn Charter School, still existing today and of high repute, which received the special support and encouragement of the founder of the province, had been chartered in 1711, and in the middle of the century was giving some elementary classical training to twenty or thirty boys in a building with a spacious yard on Fourth Street below Chestnut, and a plainer English education to possibly as many more in another location.¹ There

¹ James Mulhern, *A History of Secondary Education in Pennsylvania*, Phila., 1933, Chapter II.

was a school in connection with Christ Church and another kept by the Swedish minister. The Moravians, always interested in education, in 1748 opened a school for boys and girls of their communion near their church on Race Street.

The greater number of boys and girls of the upper and middle classes, however, received their education, such as it was, from individual schoolmasters who, in their own homes, gave lessons in the elementary branches and even in Latin, modern languages, and more or less advanced mathematics. The newspapers bristle with their advertisements.

Mr. Charles Fortesque offers to teach at his home in the alley commonly called Mr. Taylors, the Latin Tongue, English in a Grammatical Manner, Navigation, Surveying, Mensuration, Dialling, Geography, Use of the Globes, the Gentleman's Astronomy, Chronology, Arithmetic, Merchants Accounting, etc. The above to be taught at Night School as well as Day.¹

Young ladies were offered instruction in French, dancing, and fine sewing. Some eighteen individual teachers advertise thus in the decade between 1740 and 1750. Some of them, such as Theophilus Grew, Thomas Godfrey, Alexander Bullen, and Stephen Vidal were well known and long established as schoolmasters and presumably had a good clientele. Anthony Benezet, after teaching boys in the Penn Charter School for ten or twelve years, established in 1755 what became a fashionable school for girls. So many of these teachers lived along Second Street, from Thomas Godfrey, right above Christ Church, down to Andrew Lamb, below Chestnut, and in Strawberry Alley just adjacent, that children "creeping like snail" or more cheerfully, as modern children do, must have filled those streets at opening and closing time.

Outside the city proper but well within its general radius a number of Presbyterian and Episcopal ministers made a regular practice of taking boys into their homes to study, and some of these ministers' dwellings, such as Francis Alison's at New London, Samuel Blair's at Faggs' Manor, Hugh Mills's at Germantown, and John Andrews' at York, became veritable academies.

¹ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Nov. 24, 1743.

There were neighborhood schools, such as that at Old St. David's, Radnor, where James Adams later taught. The well-trained and well-stored minds that constantly surprise the student of our early history by their emergence in unexpected places may be largely accounted for by the influence of an apostolic succession of individual learned and devoted teachers.

If the inadequacy of means of education in Philadelphia was marked at the top, it was still more evident at the bottom. Although boys and girls whose parents were able to pay for private teaching were obtaining the rudiments of an education, the great body of the poor here, as elsewhere, were growing up in absolute ignorance. A deep concern for this is a striking characteristic of the time in all English-speaking countries. It meets us at many points, especially among religious-minded people. One instance of it is the plan of a group of pious men in Philadelphia in 1740 to collect funds for the establishment of a free school for boys and girls. To this proposal we must return later.

At the same time the fertile mind of Franklin was turning to the need for higher schooling in Pennsylvania. It was a college or high-grade academy such as the great English endowed schools that he had in mind. He remarks in his *Proposals*, "It has long been regretted as a misfortune to the youth of this province that we have no academy in which they might receive the accomplishments of a regular education." Long afterward he wrote in his *Autobiography* concerning his life in Philadelphia at this time: "There were two things that I regretted, there being no provision for defense or for a complete education of youth: no militia nor any college." A plan to meet the second of these needs he formulated in 1743 and proposed to put before the public, but he was deterred by inability to secure the services of the man he had picked to take charge of it. This was the Reverend Richard Peters, a highly educated and able young clergyman, for a while attached to Christ Church but at this time successful in obtaining an appointment in the service of the Proprietary which he was not willing to relinquish for the sake of accepting Franklin's offer. Nor were the times favorable to new projects, for war was threatening, so Franklin let his scheme, as he says, "lie for a while dormant." Others had similar ideas in mind. Thomas Penn, the

Proprietor, had thought of some such plan, for he complained when a later plan was proposed that it was not at all in accordance with the one he had in mind. Presbyterians were already discussing the need that finally led to the foundation of Princeton.

Among these recognitions of the need for more formal education in Philadelphia it is the plan of the little group of men who in 1740 did actually establish a trust for the free education of boys and girls, and Franklin's postponed plans of 1743 that are of special interest for us. The trust for a charity school became our first educational responsibility; the building erected under that trust became the first home of the College; the belief in higher education, the energy, and the practical wisdom of Franklin made an institution arise where there had been merely an aspiration. It was to take the fifteen years from 1740 to 1755 for these germs to develop into the full stature of the College of Philadelphia.

Chapter 2

THE FOUNDATION

1740-1755

THE INFLUENCE OF WHITEFIELD

THE arrival in Philadelphia in November 1739 of George Whitefield, a young Anglican clergyman, on a preaching mission, proved to be an event of much influence upon the early stages of this development. He was the greatest of all revivalists. His energy, his zeal for the conversion of souls, his native gifts of eloquence carried him like a rushing wind through all the colonies. "In journeyings often," like Paul, through eight years of impetuous activity he awakened and divided his own and other denominations, and stirred to spiritual concern thousands of men and women who had previously had no religious interest. Cowper said of him:

Paul's love of Christ and steadiness unbribed
 Were copied close in him and well transcribed;
 He followed Paul, his zeal a kindred flame,
 His apostolic charity the same.
 Like him crossed cheerfully tempestuous seas
 Forsaking country, kindred, friends and ease.¹

On his first arrival in Philadelphia, at the invitation of the rector of Christ Church he read the service on Sunday and preached there daily to crowded congregations. After the first few days, the church being overfilled, he preached a second time each day from the steps of the Court House, in the middle of Market Street at Second, to crowds that filled the streets. Ten days of this

¹ "Hope," lines 580-87.

had to suffice for Philadelphia for the time, and he passed on through New Jersey, New York, and all the settled back parts of Pennsylvania; then back to England, to return again to the colonies in successive missionary journeys. Philadelphia was the port at which he usually landed after his visits to England, and it was to Philadelphia he returned after his preaching journeys by land. He said of Philadelphia after passing through all the other colonies, "It seems to me the garden of America."

The numbers of his audiences in England and America are perhaps exaggerated; they are placed by contemporary newspapers and his own *Journal* at six thousand, twelve thousand, and even eighteen thousand. He was reported to have preached to twenty thousand at Moorfields and to thirty thousand on Kennington Common. Franklin, listening to him from the outskirts of a crowd in Philadelphia, with his usual ingenuity calculated that he could have been easily heard by thirty thousand. He was without doubt a great orator, wringing the hearts of his auditors, and drawing them again and again to listen "in awful silence" to the magic of his voice and to submit their minds to the spell of his eloquence. Franklin, who knew and, curiously enough considering the contrariety of their natures, liked him, said of him with unusual warmth, in a letter to his brother, "He is a good man and I love him"; and at a later time when Whitefield's motives had been questioned, "He was in all his conduct a perfectly honest man; our friendship was sincere on both sides and lasted till his death."

He bears witness to the power and clearness of his voice, the distinctness of his enunciation, and the fact that, especially in sermons he had preached repeatedly, ". . . every accent, every emphasis, every modulation of voice was so perfectly well toned and well placed that without being interested in the subject one could not help being pleased with the discourse; a pleasure of much the same kind with that received from an excellent piece of music." As to his persuasiveness Franklin tells a humorous story. Having determined not to subscribe to one of Whitefield's charities, he changed his mind while listening, deciding to give the copper in his pocket, then the silver, and finally, he says: "I emptied my pocket wholly into the collector's dish, gold and

all." His friend Thomas Hopkinson, who with a like determination had taken the precaution of emptying his pockets before leaving home, tried to borrow from a neighbor in the crowd, who refused his request with the assurance that at any other time he would lend him freely but perceived that he was now out of his senses.

Temporary aberration under the influence of passionate oratory is not unknown, but seldom does oratory have such cool material to work on as the narrator of this anecdote. Moreover, while a deist like Franklin might listen to Whitefield with enjoyment of the cadences of his speech or with a half-amused acknowledgment of his powers of persuasion, to others his preaching was part of that "Great Awakening" that worked like a ferment in the colonies in the middle years of the eighteenth century. The great body of those who heard Whitefield were stirred to their depths. The "awe, the silent attention" of his auditors, described by an attendant at one of his sermons, must often have masked a heart filled by his warnings with dread and foreboding of eternal condemnation. He insisted on the necessity of conversion, that every Christian must go through a dark crisis of conviction of sin, to be followed by a joyful assurance of salvation. A certain thread of Calvinist "election" must have awakened doubts in the hearts of many whether such assurance in their case might be possible.

He is said by his friends to have deprecated outward show of religious feeling, yet his *Journal* is full of evidence of its display by his hearers.

The Holy Ghost enabled me to preach with such power to them and some others in the evening that one was thrown into strong convulsions by the violence of her convictions. Others were in great agonies.

All, I believe, were melted.

Preached twice here this day—there was one cried out and shrieked most piteously and would not be comforted.

Several cried out in different parts, and others were to be seen wringing their hands and weeping bitterly.

Most of the people were drowned in tears. The word was sharper than a two-edged sword. The bitter cries and groans were enough to

pierce the hardest heart. Some of the people were as pale as death, others were wringing their hands, others lying on the ground, others sinking into the arms of their friends, and most lifting up their eyes to heaven and crying to God for mercy.

There was an affecting meeting, and several who had been in Bondage before at that time received Joy in the Holy Ghost.¹

This emotional excitement was strongly disapproved of by the more conservative clergy, many of whom realized that they themselves had undergone no such experience. They denied the necessity of such a crisis in the life of a Christian and doubted its profitableness. They may also have resented the decline in attendance at their own services. Umbrage may likewise have been taken at his practice of carrying money away from the city, for at one morning service he collected £110 and at the evening service in the same day £80 for the use of his orphan house in Savannah, Georgia.² His rigorous moral code was disturbing. The owner of the building in Lodge Alley in which the Assembly, a dancing school, and concerts were held, coming under the new influence, handed over the keys of that building to one of Whitefield's companions, who locked it up on the ground that its objects were "inconsistent with the Doctrines of the Gospel." The "Gentlemen of the Assembly" caused the door to be broken open again and threatened to cane the man who had locked it up. A controversy broke out in the newspapers, and it is recorded that at the next Assembly night "no company came."

Many others were displeased with his appeal to the emotions, opposed to his doctrines, and offended by his bitter denunciations of those who differed with him. "Remarks upon Mr. Whitefield, showing him a man under Delusion" was one of the mildest of the many critical publications that began to appear.³ The vicar of Old St. David's at Radnor writes home in July 1740 to his patrons, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts:

¹ *Whitefield's Journal*, May 15; Nov. 17, 20, 21; Dec. 1, 1740.

² *Whitefield's Journal*, April 20, 1740; William Seward, *Journal of a Voyage from Savannah to Philadelphia . . .*, London, 1740, p. 5; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Sept. 29, Oct. 11, 1744; Luke Tyerman, *Life of the Rev. George Whitefield*, London, 1876, I, 388.

³ George Gillespie, Minister of the Gospel, *Remarks, etc.*, Phila., 1742.

It may perhaps be somewhat surprising to the Honorable Society to find so great a difference between this and the last account I sent you; but did they know how much pains and labor the Rev. Mr. Whitefield has lately spent among us to rob us of our characters and then of our hearers, their wonder would immediately cease. This thrilling preacher, what by a musical voice, by an agreeable delivery, a brazen forehead, impudent asseverations, uncharitable assertions, and impious imprecations upon himself, if what he says be not true, has raised such a confusion among the people of this province as I believe will not be laid in haste, and (which I am troubled about) has made a very great rent in all the congregations belonging to the Church of England. The generality of my hearers not only run after, but adore him as an oracle from heaven. They look upon all he says to be the immediate dictates of the Holy Ghost. Only because he confidently asserts it to be so, and imprecates the most dreadful curses upon himself, if what he says be not true. There is a very large church abuilding for him in the City towards which all sorts of people have contributed.¹

Thus Whitefield's ministrations brought not peace but a sword into the conventional religious and social life of Philadelphia. When, therefore, in April 1740, he returned to the city from the second of his preaching journeys he found a serious change in his position among the more conservative elements of the city. He was met on the street soon after his arrival by the rector of Christ Church, who told him that he could no longer preach there; and this reception was typical of many. Although before his American journeys were over he was invited back even by the most conservative churches, for the next few years he was excluded from Episcopal and from many Presbyterian pulpits, and became almost entirely a "preacher in the fields," to use Franklin's words. He was received as a guest by the Quaker schoolmaster Anthony Benezet, and was welcomed by one faction of the Presbyterians, by the Baptists, the Moravians, and the German sects. He preached to great assemblies from the Court House steps, from the balcony of the Loxley house at Second and Spruce streets and at one time, from a platform built for the purpose, to thousands of hearers facing him on the slope of Society Hill. Among the masses, admiration and affection for

¹ Henry Pleasants, *History of Old St. David's Church*, Phila., 1915, p. 105.

him were still unbounded. It was obvious that if his preaching was to continue in the latitude of Philadelphia a place must be provided for it where there would be protection from the weather. The religious revival must have a home.

It will be remembered that there were in Philadelphia at this time a group of advocates of the establishment of a free or charity school. A movement for the establishment of charity schools was now at its height in all English-speaking countries.¹ There is no more characteristic phase of the "Age of Benevolence," as the eighteenth century has been called, than the opening of schools for the poor. Along with missions at home and abroad, the alleviation of the lot of Negro slaves, foundlings, factory children, chimney sweeps, and the aged and infirm, the improvement of prisons and of the criminal law, literally thousands of free schools were founded in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales; the fringes of the wave spread to the colonies. There were said to be at one time 1,329 such schools in England, with more than twenty-three thousand scholars. "Charity Schools" was the general term applied to these institutions, though they were of great variety, alike only in their pious purpose, the elementary English content of their teaching, and their establishment among the children of the poor. Many of them were established by the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, an Anglican organization, but most were set up by the Methodists or by other religious groups or persons of more ardent piety. It is not a matter of surprise therefore that the religious revival accompanying Whitefield's preaching should suggest the foundation of such a school among the poor in Philadelphia. Those who initiated it were a group of plain men, mostly mechanics; and several of them Moravians, who were both pious and interested in education.

Whitefield himself had been much interested in charity schools in England and Wales. While a student at Oxford from 1732 to 1736, as he says in his *Journal*, "two or three small Charity schools maintained by the Methodists were under my more immediate inspection." Early in 1739, the year in which he first came to Philadelphia, he laid the corner stone of a charity school

¹ See M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement*, Cambridge (England), 1938.

being built by the colliers at Kingswood near Bristol. He was on friendly terms with Griffith Jones, who busied himself organizing a group of such schools in Wales. He was constantly being appealed to in England by churchwardens and school managers, as he was afterwards to be in America, to preach for the benefit of the children. The institution he set up in Savannah, Georgia, and for which he collected the £190 sterling was a charity school, though it was also an orphan asylum and, in his dreams, was ultimately to include a college for the planters' sons of the South. He started another at Darien in Georgia.

In Philadelphia the two objects, a free school and a building for Whitefield and free preaching, were now combined; land was procured and in the early months of 1740 building was begun. The two oldest pieces lying among the archives of the University are a bill for some building materials, [£5 6s. 8d.] for a "Bill of Scantlings," dated June 1740, and a faded piece of copy for an advertisement in the newspapers, dated July of the same year. The advertisement, reads, after a pious introduction laying stress on toleration:

With this view it hath been thought proper to erect a large Building for a Charity School for the instruction of Poor Children gratis in useful Literature and the Knowledge of the Christian Religion; and also for a House of Public Worship, the Houses in this place being insufficient to contain the great numbers who convene on such Occasions; and it being impracticable to meet in the open air at all times of the year, because of the inclemency of the weather. . . . The Building is actually begun . . . and the Foundation laid . . .¹

The names of those in charge of the plan soon appear and should be commemorated. They are our first Trustees. In ac-

¹ Those who are interested in historical analogies may be struck with the parallel between these events and a similar series of occurrences that took place in Bohemia three hundred and fifty years before. Just as this hall providing for Whitefield's preaching was put up by a group of citizens in Philadelphia in 1740, so the "Bethlehem Chapel" was built at the expense of two city merchants of Prague in the year 1391 as a place for public preaching in the native language. It was independent of the cathedral and the parish churches of the city, just as this was independent of the denominational churches of Philadelphia. Here John Huss and a series of revivalist clergymen preached for twenty years till their teachings were condemned as heretical, along with the preachers themselves, at the Council of Constance in 1414.

cordance with the legal practice of the time there were two groups of Trustees. The first group, of four, were the holders of the land and building. They were, as has been said, mostly very plain men. They were Edmund Wooley, carpenter, John Coats, brickmaker, John Howell, weaver, and William Price, carpenter. The second group, of nine, known as "Trustees for Uses," were responsible for seeing that the objects of the trust were carried out. They were of somewhat higher social position. They were Whitefield himself, William Seward, his English traveling companion, John Benezet, Robert Eastburn, and James Read, all Philadelphia merchants, Samuel Hazard and John Noble, merchants of New York, Edward Evans, a shoemaker, and Charles Brockden, a well-known Philadelphia conveyancer to whom Franklin often refers. This was an entirely non-sectarian group, though as a matter of fact five of the thirteen were Moravians, a denomination which had recently been making many converts. They were evidently religious men, for the children in the school are to be trained in Christian doctrine, the ministers who preach in the hall must be "sound in principle and acquainted with experimental religion in their hearts"; and the whole project is repeatedly described as a pious work.¹

At Fourth and Arch streets was a tract of land, bought in 1703 from Penn's land commissioners by John Chandler. It was at that time bordered on the south and west by open lots. It had been inherited from Chandler by his daughter Mary, wife of Jonathan Price, a carpenter; both she and her husband became interested in the plan for putting up a building for a school and for popular preaching; and from them the four Trustees who were to hold the property obtained in 1740 a portion of this ground fronting on Fourth Street and extending back, approxi-

¹ Franklin's statement in the latter part of his *Autobiography*, written more than forty years later, that "if the Mufti of Constantinople were to send a missionary to preach Mohammedanism to us he would find a pulpit at his service" is an exaggeration due to an old man's lapse of memory. None but orthodox Christian clergymen could preach in the building. Franklin was no doubt confused by his strong impression of the non-sectarian character of the trust. Nor does there seem to be any basis for his statement that he was himself elected one of the Trustees. The list is given in various contemporary records but nowhere includes his name.

mately 250 feet, to Christ Church burial ground. The land was obtained by the Trustees at no initial cost, but it was burdened, like so much property in Philadelphia, with a ground rent—in this case £15 a year. Some money was collected, building, as already noted, was begun early in 1740, and by November of that year when Whitefield returned to the city, foundations had been laid for a structure of ambitious size, one hundred feet by seventy, larger than any building then in the city, and the walls had been raised shoulder high. Shift was made for a floor and seats, and he preached in the still roofless building to crowded congregations every day of his stay. Renewed efforts were made for subscriptions, and another year found the “New Building,” as it continued long to be called, roofed and completed. Whitefield preached there at each subsequent visit, as in 1745, when at the height of his popularity he was met outside the city and conducted into town by fifty men on horseback. More than a hundred years later, in 1855, some religious people still called it “Whitefield Chapel.”

The New Building became one of the show places of Philadelphia; it appears conspicuously in at least one contemporary plan of the city and is frequently mentioned. A Presbyterian clergyman in June 1741 baptized there eight persons “who had been of the people called Quakers.” A young diplomat from Maryland passing through Philadelphia in 1744, as secretary of a commission on its way to make a treaty with the Indians at Lancaster, records in his diary that he visited it on a Sunday afternoon and heard the preacher, “a disciple of the Great Whitefield . . . split his text . . . turn up his eyes” and “cuff his cushions” as well as his master could have done. In 1745 some mischief-makers broke into the building and damaged the pulpit, cushions, and benches. It is mentioned by the Swedish botanist Kalm on his visit in 1747. We hear of its being used for other than its originally intended purposes; when late in the year 1747 an “association” was being formed for the military defense of the city, a meeting was held there which Franklin addressed, and there were laid out for signature blank forms of agreements to serve. The group of dissident Presbyterians who had formed a congregation under

Gilbert Tennent in 1743 but had no place of worship of their own provided the major portion of the funds for its completion and regularly used it for their services.

Its educational use, however, lagged. Whitefield, as one of the appointed Trustees for Uses, at first took his share of responsibility seriously. On November 20, 1740, writing from Salem, New Jersey, to a New York friend as he was about to start for Georgia, he described with enthusiasm the New Building in which he had just been preaching, and declared his intention of seeking a suitable master and mistress for the Charity School.¹ But constantly "evangelizing," and involved in religious disputes in England and America, he took no steps toward the organization of the school. Three of the Trustees died within the next few years. The Moravians, who were so largely represented among its sponsors, seem to have found other interests. In 1741 the Moravian leader, Count Zinzendorf, arrived in Philadelphia and played a part among the German-speaking people not dissimilar to that of Whitefield among the English. A year later, under his influence, and doubtless largely by his means, a Moravian church building was erected in Race Street only a block or two from the New Building, and soon afterward a school was opened there. There is abundant evidence also that the tide of religious excitement was receding, and it may have carried with it the pious interest in the education of the poor. It is possible that the original non-sectarian subscribers were annoyed at the regular use of the building by Gilbert Tennent's Presbyterian congregation; a visitor in 1747 speaks of it as their meeting-house. Whatever the cause, the years passed and the primary purpose for which the New Building had been erected remained unfulfilled. There was as yet no school. There were unpaid bills as well as unfulfilled engagements.

When the group of Trustees for Uses who were legally responsible for carrying out the object of the trust had taken no action for seven years, the two surviving members of the group named to acquire and hold the land and building, with a number of the original subscribers, laid before the Provincial Assembly a petition calling attention to the failure to establish the school.

¹ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Dec. 4, 1740.

They asked the Assembly to require the Trustees either themselves to pay outstanding bills and refund subscriptions or to allow the sale of the building and the land on which it stood for these purposes. This petition twice was laid on the table and then the matter was postponed to the next session. Two of the Trustees for Uses, Brockden and Read, then replied that they intended to lay before the Assembly a full defense for their acts, but asked delay on account of the absence of some of their number from the province; action was again postponed. The explanation of the Trustees, which would have been so helpful to the historian, was never made, and two years later, July 6, 1749, Franklin wrote to Whitefield that the affair of the building was still *in statu quo*.¹

THE ACADEMY

However, this ninth year of delay was to prove the last. A sudden opportunity for escape from their difficulties now presented itself to the Trustees. A group of men of position and wealth offered to buy the New Building, to pay all outstanding debts, and to agree to carry out the trusts incumbent upon it. These men had a new plan, largely inspired by Franklin, to meet the long-standing need of Philadelphia for an institution of higher learning, and they required a building in which it could be established.

Thus Franklin steps on the stage to assume in the eyes of posterity the rôle of principal founder of the University. The term "founder," notwithstanding its increasing use in modern times, is not a well-chosen one. There were no individual "founders" of colonial colleges; neither Benjamin Franklin nor John Harvard nor Elihu Yale were in the modern sense founders of the institutions with whose early careers they are so closely associated. No one of them gave any substantial amount of money. Only men with the great fortunes of modern times have been individual founders of American colleges and universities. Great as was the rôle of Franklin in the development of the in-

¹ Votes of the Assembly, IV, 55, 56, 59, 62; A. H. Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, N.Y., 1905-7, II, 377.

stitution about to take shape, it was not that of a founder in a financial sense. He gave it his services and a moderate subscription, but no endowment; nor was its curriculum his, but rather a compromise with the ideas of others in which his were original but persistently subordinated to theirs. A generation afterwards the Trustees of 1779 defined the term and claimed the title of "Founders" for their predecessors. "Twenty-four gentlemen of Philadelphia voluntarily united themselves as Founders."¹ It would be fairer to say that Academy, College, University, grew up in response to community needs, of which Franklin was the spokesman. It was a product of its native soil; it was a legitimate child of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, although its claims to inheritance, to responsibility, and to trust have been through all its history but inadequately acknowledged.

Yet during the next eight years, from 1749 to 1757, when he left for his first prolonged stay abroad, Franklin's hand was felt on the young institution at every turn. He was already in a certain sense the leading citizen of Philadelphia; we have his own assurance of it, although if William Allen, Tench Francis, Richard Peters, and certain other citizens had written autobiographies, he would perhaps not seem to occupy a position so nearly unique. The long public career which was to raise him to national and international eminence was in 1749 still ahead of him, but in his own city he had become well-to-do, the successful publisher of a newspaper and of the most popular of all almanacs, had been more than once elected Grand Master of the Philadelphia Lodge of Freemasons, was a pewholder in Christ Church, Deputy Postmaster of Philadelphia; a common councilman of the city, and Clerk of the Provincial Assembly of which he was next year to become a member. He had already begun that series of observations in the new and popular field of electricity that was to bring him into the notice of the whole intellectual world. He touched the life of his city at a score of points. No doubt or question of his essential greatness can diminish the impressiveness of that series of civic improvements of which he had already sown the seed, or of the course of political beneficence on

¹ Report of Trustees of the College, Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia to the State Legislature, 1779, Minutes of Board of Trustees, Vol. II, p. 122.

which he was about to enter. After the experience with the little group of plain but book-loving and discussion-loving companions that made up his Junto, he had brought about the establishment of the first colonial subscription library and the first American learned society. He aided Philadelphia physicians in the establishment of the first hospital in the province. He was now about to exercise his organizing genius upon education.

Just what were Franklin's ideas with respect to education it is hard to discover, for those he had formulated in 1743 he had not published, those in the *Proposals* of 1749 were a compromise between his own and those of others. As he tells us in regard to the proposed curriculum, "Mr. Allen, Mr. Francis, Mr. Peters and some other persons of wealth and learning whose subscriptions and countenances we should need, being of the opinion that it should include the learned languages I submitted my judgment to theirs." His *Account of the Academy* laid before City Council in 1750, and his *Idea of the English School* published in 1751, had the same practical object. His views expressed in his *Observations* forty years later bear the evident marks of bitterness and conflict. His main ideas are, however, pretty clear. He would have had an education utilitarian rather than cultural, entirely in the English language, though following the best models in that language, devoting much attention to training in thought and expression. It should include mathematics, geography, history, logic, and natural and moral philosophy. It should be an education for citizenship, and should lead to mercantile and civic success and usefulness. It is unfortunate that it was never tried.

As a matter of fact it was not the educational ideals of Franklin so much as his energy, originality, astuteness, and civic influence that gave him leadership in the advanced step in education that was now about to be made. Franklin was no dogmatist and, reluctant as he may have been to give up some of his ideas, after consultation with some of his friends and accepting their advice, he printed his well known pamphlet *Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pensilvania*, sending it gratis along with his newspaper to all his subscribers. In accordance with his usual method of striking while the iron was hot, immediately

after the circulation of the *Proposals*, subscriptions were asked for among the more influential and well-to-do men of the community. Some fifty or more citizens pledged larger or smaller amounts and for longer or shorter periods. Franklin and Tench Francis, Attorney-General of the province, were appointed by these contributors to draw up a set of "Constitutions for a Public Academy in the City of Philadelphia," and twenty-four of the largest subscribers agreed to serve as Trustees for the proposed foundation. These Trustees met November 13, 1749, signed the "Constitutions" laid before them by Franklin and Francis, elected Franklin their president, and another of their number, William Coleman, treasurer.

They were a strikingly different group from the Trustees of the New Building. They were the most prominent men in the city—"the principal Gentlemen in the Province," as Franklin describes them. The names of more than half of them are followed by the title "Esquire" which, in the practice of the time, indicated the holding of some provincial or city office, prominent legal standing or, occasionally, merely social distinction. Eight of this body were notably wealthy merchants, four were prominent physicians, several were or had been judges, and most of them were also members of the Provincial Assembly or City Council. The only two who were in any sense artisans were Franklin who, with the pride of the self-made man, signed himself "Printer," and Philip Syng, "Silversmith." Syng was an artist in his craft, a scientific observer, member of the Junto, and director of the Library, a man of good social standing, and a vestryman of Christ Church. Franklin's old associates of the Junto, or such of them as had risen in the world, were largely represented, along with vestrymen of Christ Church and Masons, all of whom were wealthy and prominent. For better or for worse this close connection of the institution with the old aristocracy of Philadelphia was destined to continue through the greater part of two centuries.¹

According to the Constitutions the Trustees were to be an unpaid body, self-perpetuating, electing their own officers, meet-

¹ For biographies of the early Trustees see T. H. Montgomery, *A History of the University of Pennsylvania*, Phila., 1900, pp. 53-108.

ing monthly or oftener, collecting and spending funds, "contracting" with masters and appointing tutors, deciding what subjects should be taught and to a considerable extent the methods of teaching. They were to set the rates for tuition and "No scholar shall be admitted or taught within the Academy, without the consent of the major part of the Trustees in writing, signed with their names"; a provision soon abandoned.

Franklin's influence must have been subordinated, as it was in the framing of the original proposals, to that of his classically trained colleagues, for in the first paragraph of the Constitutions the school is described as "An Academy for Teaching the Latin and Greek languages," with the teaching of "the English Tongue grammatically and as a language" given second place, and the mother tongue generally relegated to a subordinate position. Moreover the master who is to teach Latin and Greek is to be the "Rector" of the Academy, with oversight of all teaching, to have a salary twice that of the English master, and to have the assistance of a tutor when teaching more than twenty students, while the English master is to teach up to forty without assistance. Apart from these discrepancies the position of the English master, due perhaps to Franklin's insistence, is an honorable and important one—an innovation in formal education. History, geography, mathematics, and rhetoric are to be taught by each of the masters to his own group of students. Except for the variety of subjects mentioned and the inclusion of English, albeit somewhat hesitantly, as an academic subject, the plan of studies hardly differed from that prevailing at the time in the Latin schools of Europe and New England.

Curiously enough the powers in England seem to have agreed with Franklin in his preference for English over the classics. Thomas Penn in a letter to Governor Hamilton, dated February 12, 1750, when he must have just received the *Proposals*, says:

Your proposal for the education of youth is much more extensive than ever I designed, and I think more so than the circumstances of the Province require. The best of our people must be men of business which I do not think very great public schools or universities render youth fit for. . . . I find people here think we go too fast

with regard to the matter and it gives an opportunity to those fools who are always telling their fears that the Colonies will set up for themselves.

There was little mention of religion in either the *Proposals* or the Constitutions. It was understood that there should be no sectarianism; it was claimed that the Trustees were selected "without regard to difference of religious persuasion," although three-fourths of them were Episcopalians, several of them vestry-men of Christ Church. Two were Quakers, one a prominent Presbyterian. The original selection was doubtless made on grounds of wealth, liberality, and social influence, the preponderance of Anglicans merely reflecting their predominance among the wealthy classes. Nevertheless this Anglican tinge colored the institution during the whole colonial period.

It was anticipated that the Trustees would visit the institution frequently "to encourage and countenance the youth, countenance and assist the Masters," that they would "look on the students as in some measure their own children, treat them with familiarity and affection," and when they completed their studies and were ready to go out into the world would "make all the interest that can be made to promote and establish them, whether in business, offices, marriages, or any other thing for their advantage, preferably to all other persons whatsoever, even of equal merit." These would be no unimportant services when offered by the most influential men of the city.

The ideal in the minds of the Founders was, evidently, of a group of interested and self-sacrificing Trustees, exercising their proposed educational functions through teachers and students under their constant and detailed management, much as they carried on their business affairs. The profits were to be the material, intellectual, and moral benefit of the students which would in turn enhance the prosperity and good order of the community. The practical advantages of preparing young men for local magistracies and "the poorer sort" for country school teaching, and the enrichment of Philadelphia by drawing from neighboring provinces students "who must spend considerable sums among us in payment for their lodging, diet, apparel, etc." were

dilated upon in a memorial drawn up by Franklin and laid before City Council the next year.

The *Proposals* and the Constitutions were something new, not only in Philadelphia but in all higher education. Educational institutions had in the past been established by groups of masters or of students for the mere love of learning, as were the medieval universities, or by religious societies for training their ministers or educating the young within their own fold, or by sovereigns to increase their prestige. The Philadelphia Academy was different from all these. It was established by a "voluntary society of founders," as they long afterward called themselves, for purely secular and civic purposes, without the support of any religious body or the patronage of any person or government. It was to owe its continuous existence to a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees carrying out these purposes with such constancy and wisdom as they should prove to possess. It was an experiment that might or might not succeed.

It had several doubtful factors. The close, continuous, and exclusive control exercised by the body of twenty-four Trustees made all its affairs, legal and educational, dependent on their sole judgment. One hundred and sixty-six years after their organization one of the Trustees could still say, "We are answerable only to our own sense of duty and responsibility. No one has the right to question us"; and another, when asked about a matter that had aroused public interest, could ask in turn, "Why should we explain?"

The requirement of frequent meetings and detailed oversight made it necessary, as indeed was recognized in the Constitutions, that the Trustees should be chosen from Philadelphia; and the provision for filling their own vacancies made it practically certain that they would, as in fact they did, continue to draw their members from among the prominent men of the city and of their own class, often of their own families, foregoing such vivifying influence and support as might come from drawing on other regions and other classes in the community. Except for a short period after the Revolution, until very recent times through all its history the Academy and its successors have had the advan-

tages and the disadvantages of control by a Board of Trustees of individual ability, eminence, and social position, but drawn from a narrow geographical radius and a closed social circle. This form of organization under a minutely governing body of Trustees under its own presiding officer deprived the Academy and College and later the University of the effective activity of that typical American administrator, the college president. Not until the present generation has the institution had, at first in power, later in name, a president.

The term "Academy" was applied to the new institution both in the *Proposals* and the Constitutions, though Franklin had always spoken of the desirability of founding a college, and, as an ultimate plan, that was probably in the minds of all participants in its establishment. As a matter of fact the names of institutions of learning were not clearly differentiated on the continent of Europe, in England, or in the colonies. Eton and Winchester, Exeter and Balliol, were alike "colleges," though the former were detached high schools, the latter parts of a university. Some further descriptive term—"school or college" as at Harvard, "collegiate school" as at Yale, "seminary of learning" as at Princeton—was necessary to indicate the higher grade of studies. The Philadelphia institution was, however, in its first two or three years only an Academy.

The Trustees had to find for their Academy a local habitation as well as a name. Franklin's idea of placing it in some village in the country, where there would be fields and a river and abundant room for the students' exercise, was abandoned, even by him, when it was realized how inconvenient such a location would be for the visits it was anticipated would be made by Trustees engaged daily in city affairs. At their first meeting two possible sites in the city suggested themselves for consideration; one was a lot on Sixth Street, opposite the State House Square.¹ It was offered without cost by its owner, James Logan, himself a Trustee. It was next to the building housing his library, the use of which had been already offered in the *Proposals* to the masters and scholars of the Academy. But a still better proposal was made.

¹ It is the lot on which now stands the building of the Curtis Publishing Company.

This was for the purchase of the New Building, standing unused save for occasional religious services, and already dedicated to educational uses. A committee was appointed to negotiate with its Trustees, and at their second meeting, on December 26, 1749, the Trustees of the Academy had before them an offer for its sale.

The great parchment deed, with all its seals and signatures intact, that lies among the University archives bears witness to their acceptance of the offer. February 1, 1750, a joint meeting of the seven surviving Trustees of the 1740 trust and twenty-one of the Trustees of the Academy was held in Mrs. Roberts' Coffee House, and all present signed this deed transferring the possessions and the duties of the old Trustees to the new. It must have been a picturesque gathering; the carpenter, the brickmaker, blacksmith, and cordwainer who were relinquishing their ownership and responsibilities discussing terms with the distinguished gentlemen who were assuming them; men who still talked of "soundness in the faith" in the spirit of Whitefield, treating with deists and sophisticated men of the world. The Trustees of the Academy paid £775. 16s. 1¼d. in full, in satisfaction of all outstanding financial claims against the building, which Franklin described to a friend as less than half what it cost. More than half of this went to the group of Presbyterian contributors who had been responsible for the completion of the New Building in 1750; £100 was for the repayment of an old loan, more than £100 was arrears of quit rents owed to the original owners of the property; a number of smaller sums were due to lesser creditors; there were even some mechanics' liens only now satisfied.

In taking over the trusts associated with the purchase of the building the Trustees of the Academy were accepting religious requirements and implications of which they had thought little. From the time of Whitefield, stress had been laid upon the pious character of the old foundation. It will be remembered that it was for instructing poor children "in useful literature and the knowledge of the Christian religion," and for "a House of Publick Worship" for preaching by such Protestant ministers as were "sound in doctrine, acquainted with the religion of the heart." The equality of all denominations in its use was one of its fundamental requirements. All of the "good and pious uses originally

intended" were insisted upon by the old Trustees and were repeated in great detail in the deed of sale. Indeed, with a curious intrusion of religious requirements into a civil transaction, the beliefs that must be held by the ministers appointed to preach in the building were incorporated in the deed. They constituted a long and detailed creed, bringing in much astonishing theology but closing on the more moderate note of assent to the ninth, thirteenth, and seventeenth articles of the Church of England, "as explained by the Calvinists in their literal and grammatical sense, without any equivocation whatsoever." It may be suspected that of the various clergymen who have been invited or allowed to preach in the building few if any have read this cryptic statement of belief.

This was not the formal religion of 1749, but the warmer and earlier piety of the Great Awakening. Nevertheless of all the religious requirements of this document only one survived to later times; this was the freedom of the institution from control by any one religious body, the tradition that among its Trustees no denomination should predominate. This was common to both periods and to both groups. It was a tolerant age.

To provide immediate payment for the building the Trustees borrowed £800 from the managers of the provincial lottery then in progress, giving their personal bonds for repayment of the loan. The financial scene at the beginning was fairer than it became later. There was general approval of the foundation of the Academy. The original subscriptions of the twenty-four Trustees and the forty or fifty general subscribers amounted to about £700 a year for three or four years. In 1750 the City Council, liberally inclined toward the Trustees of the Academy, since the two bodies were interlocking directorates, gave £200 for alteration of the New Building to serve its new uses, and £50 a year each to the Charity School and the Academy, for the next five years, with reservation of the right to send each year one scholar from the Charity School to the Academy to be educated gratis—our first free scholarship. Mayor Lawrence, with the approval of the City Council, contributed £100 of his salary for the year 1750 to the Academy instead of giving the usual mayor's

entertainment. A London banking firm made the Academy a present of £100 sterling.

On these funds there were of course many demands. The New Building was rapidly but at considerable expense transformed for its new uses. Most of the year 1750 was used in these alterations made under the charge of a committee of the Trustees, of which, as was inevitable, Franklin was the most active member. The treasurer's accounts are burdened with payments for bricks, lumber, plaster, wages, and such familiarly recurring items of that day as "drink for the brick-layers, 2s. 3d.," "laborers for drink 5 shillings," "carpenters for drink 7s," "provisions at raising of the belfry £4. 8s. 2d." all of which doubtless helped to get the work completed within a year from the purchase of the building. More ground was gradually bought, adjacent to the first tract, until the Academy had at Fourth and Arch streets an adequate setting which will be described in detail later.

It remained to find teachers and students and books. This was largely achieved within the same year, 1750. With an appropriation of £100 sterling, some books and equipment were secured from London. The hand of Franklin is probably recognizable in the spending of more than one half the sums for "mathematical and philosophical" apparatus. Masters were recruited, mostly among school teachers in and around Philadelphia. The Rector sat through August at the post office to receive applications for admission. We hear that boys are enrolling daily, and in the middle of September Franklin writes to a friend that the Academy has more than a hundred students. The four earliest pupils enrolled seem to have been two nephews of Rev. Richard Peters, George Lea, and John Potts.¹

On December 18, 1750, the Trustees gave notice that the classes would be opened January 7, 1751. On that day with great ceremony they walked in procession, the Governor of the province at their head, the six blocks from his house on Market Street to the reconstructed New Building, where before a

¹ It may be remarked, parenthetically, that this John Potts, son of a Chester County ironmaster, was the great-granduncle of the present writer, who entered Pennsylvania 130 years later.

crowded audience one of their number, Rev. Richard Peters, preached a commemoration sermon. This historical address was afterwards published, and has since served historians as a principal source of information concerning the early institution.

The classrooms were not quite ready, so the boys met for a few weeks or possibly months in a warehouse belonging to William Allen, at Second and Arch streets. Not long after the opening we know from the treasurer's records that 145 pupils had been enrolled and had paid their fees.

The agreement with the old Trustees to open the long delayed Free School weighed on the minds of the Trustees. Apart from the trust incumbent on them, they, like many other citizens of Philadelphia, shared the general eighteenth-century concern for the education of the lower classes. This was reflected in the statement of many of the old creditors of the New Building that they willingly remitted or reduced their claims in consideration of its approaching use for that purpose. It was indicated also by the generous collections after sermons delivered at various times by Mr. Peters and Mr. Whitefield for the same object; these amounted altogether to some £300. Therefore in September 1751, ten years after it had been first proposed and four months after the opening of the Academy, the Free School was inaugurated in the building originally planned for it. It was now, however, but the stepchild in the family, although its few and scattered records show that it filled from the beginning quite as great a demand as the Academy itself. It began with twenty boys; a year later the number admitted was sixty. Its master was a George Price, who unfortunately had to be removed three years later because of his "intemperate drinking of strong liquors" and his "unjustified severity to the children"; he was aided by a tutor. The Trustees obtained much popular credit for the establishment of this philanthropy. In the fall of 1753 a Mrs. Frances Holwell, keeper of a dame school for little children in the city, was engaged to take charge of thirty girls, somewhat later of fifty, with an assistant to teach them reading, sewing, and knitting. They were established in one of the upper rooms of what was now known as the Academy Building, and an appropriation of

£3 was made to buy books, canvas, and "cruels," doubtless that they might work samplers like their well-to-do sisters.¹

The Academy was now fully organized and in running order, with the provisions of the Constitutions and of the earlier trusts being carried out. To give the institutions recognition and permanency a charter from the Proprietaries seemed proper. Steps toward this were taken by the appointment of Attorney-General Francis by the Trustees at their meeting of June 9, 1752, to draw up a form of charter to be sent to England to obtain official probation. Consent was readily given by Thomas and Richard Penn, the Proprietaries, along with a donation of £500 to show their interest in the project. The ordinary delays of ocean travel and official procrastination postponed the completion of the negotiation to the next year. In April 1753, however, word came through Secretary Peters that the Penns had ordered the signature of the Charter. In July the Trustees in a body went to the Governor's house and received at his hands and with his congratulations the engrossed Charter and the warrant for attachment of the provincial seal and registry at the Rolls Office. The Charter was made out to "The Trustees of the Academy and Charitable School in the Province of Pennsylvania." This recognition of the Academy from the source of authority was considered a great event in its history and called forth a series of four declamations delivered at the Academy by four boys of the Latin School—Francis Hopkinson, John Morris, Josiah Martin, and William Mather. The drafts of these speeches, rather remarkable, if somewhat stilted, productions for boys of fourteen to sixteen years of age, were duly sent to England and in turn were brought back to this country along with other Penn papers and are now in the Pennsylvania Historical Society library. On one of them is the suggestive endorsement, "Neither masters nor any other person that we know of gave any assistance."²

The Academy once instituted might be used for various purposes. It might serve as a training school for the schoolmasters

¹ Treasurer's Reports; Trustees' Minutes; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 19, 1753, Oct. 18, 1754.

² Two of them are printed in T. H. Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

to be established by the British Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge among the Germans on the Pennsylvania frontier. It was in fact so used to train Samuel Magaw for his position in Lancaster. When the granting of degrees was authorized, there was a proposition, in 1755, to "ingraft a seminary upon the Philadelphia College" by which half a dozen or more students should be maintained there, at the same time reading divinity under the minister of the First Presbyterian Church in the city, till they took their degrees, and thus avoid being subjected to the objectionable influence of the "New Lights" who controlled the "seminary called Jersey College."

The most picturesque of the early recruits for the varied population of the new Philadelphia institution were some Indian boys. Two of them, Mohawks, known under their English names as Jonathan and Philip, sons of Jonathan Gayenquitigoa, were sent down to Philadelphia in the spring of 1755 by Conrad Weiser at the request of their father to be taught to read and write English. They were at the Academy for two years and had acquired at least that much of an English education when unfortunately in the fall of 1756, during an epidemic of smallpox, the older, Jonathan, died. John Montour, son of Andrew Montour, scion of the notable half-breed family of Montours so famous as interpreters in the colonial Indian history of Pennsylvania, was a student at the English school of the Academy in 1756 and 1757. The Montour children were in Philadelphia as wards of Governor Morris.¹

THE COLLEGE

The Governor's mansion played a large part in the life of the young institution: there was one more step to be taken of which it was to be the scene. To the modest powers of the Academy under the Constitutions and the Charter of 1753 was to be added the right to give the usual collegiate and honorary degrees. Franklin had spoken of his plans for "an academy or college," and anticipated the Academy soon becoming "a regular college."² In

¹ *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, VII, 454.

² Franklin to Dr. Johnson, August 9, 1750.

the deed of 1750 the old Trustees, in turning over their building and trusts to the new, authorized them to use the building for a "college or academy" as well as for the free school. The studies that usually led to the grant of a degree had already within the first two or three years of its existence been introduced into the Academy. It was only the dread of expense and perhaps some fear of the disapproval of the Proprietor that held back the Trustees from asking an extension of their charter and undertaking a more ambitious plan of education. The taking of this next step was largely due to the appearance of a new and vigorous figure in Philadelphia.

Among the many instances of Franklin's influence on the Academy and the College, and indeed on the city and state, there were few more pregnant than his introduction into that society of Dr. William Smith. There were unquestionably times afterward when he came to doubt his own astuteness in having done so. When William Smith entered on the scene, however, in 1753, he seemed a man after Franklin's own heart. He was a young Scotchman, twenty-five years of age, of remarkable vigor of mind, positiveness of opinion, and fertility of production. In his long life there was scarcely a subject with which he came in contact on which he did not write a pamphlet or a letter, or deliver an address or a sermon, or produce a poem. He was born in or near Aberdeen, was educated in one of the good primary schools of Scotland, and studied, but apparently was not graduated, at the University of Aberdeen, which, however, subsequently gave him the honorary degree that led to his always being spoken of as Doctor Smith. He was in 1750 tutor to the two sons of a gentleman in London, and in 1751 came with this family to the vicinity of New York, where his active mind drew him immediately into the ecclesiastical and educational disputes that then enlivened that city.

He must have seen Franklin's *Proposals of 1749* and *Idea of the English School* of 1751, and have known something of the foundation of the Academy, for in a pamphlet published in 1752 he speaks of the "neighboring colleges of New England and Pennsylvania." Later in the same year he threw his own ideas on education into the form of a description of a supposititious academy,

which he called the *College of Mirania*. In this he refers to Franklin's *Idea of the English School* as a model for the more utilitarian section of his proposed college. It was doubtless through this essay, a copy of which he sent to Franklin, that the two men were brought together. There was another opportunity for personal contact when in the next year Smith brought his two charges, the sons of Mr. Martin, to Philadelphia to enter them in the Academy. He was complimented on this visit by the recitation of a poem of his by one of the students, and returned the compliment some months later by publishing a poem "On Visiting the Academy of Philadelphia, June 1753." In it he appeals to the college in New York which was to become Columbia, then just struggling into existence, to rival the Philadelphia institution:

For can I celebrate such wisdom here
O much loved York, nor drop a duteous tear?
Rise, nobly rise! Dispute the prize with those
as Athens, rivaling Lacedaemon, rose.

· · · · ·
This nobler strife, ye nobler sisters feed!
Be yours the contest in each worthy deed!

He prepared also, as a memorial of his visit, a little tract, *Prayers for the Use of the Philadelphia Academy*, which was published by Franklin later in the same year.

In the meantime a series of letters exchanged between him and Franklin made clear their mutual desire that he should be attached in some way to the new Academy. Franklin had long held the belief, notwithstanding the close control of the Trustees, that a strong personality should be placed at the head of the Academy, at least on its teaching side. This was evident from his proffer of a directing position to Mr. Peters in 1743, and from his long but futile correspondence with Dr. Johnson of Connecticut in 1750 and 1751 in an effort to secure him as the first Rector of the Academy. William Smith was just such a man as he had in mind, well educated, vigorous, interested in education and himself anxious for a connection with the Philadelphia institution. Franklin therefore used all his influence with the Trustees to secure his service, assuring them that "a good teacher of the higher branches

of learning would draw enough new scholars to the Academy to pay a great part, if not the whole of his salary." Even the hard sense of Franklin held the delusion that higher education would pay its own way.¹

So in May 1754 the Trustees boldly engaged William Smith as an additional master to teach "Logick, Rhetorick, Ethicks and Natural Philosophy." His appointment was at first "upon trial" and without agreement as to salary, but was soon made definite and his salary established at £200 per year, in addition to a grant of £50 a year made by the Proprietaries. Their suspicions of the ambitious young institution had been allayed. They were led to believe, justifiably as it proved, that the appointment of Dr. Smith would favor their interests in the colony; so they had responded favorably to the appeal of the Trustees for financial help in adding these courses in the higher branches of the arts and sciences to its offerings. The new appointee came to Philadelphia and entered in his diary, "25 May, 1754, commenced teaching in the Philosophy class, also Ethics and Rhetoric to the advanced pupils. I have two classes—a Senior and a Junior one." It was the beginning of a career of fifty years of teaching these subjects and seemed to him a justification of the advancement of the Academy to college grade.

This step came six months later when Smith and the Rector laid before the Trustees a recommendation that the Charter should be so amended as to authorize the grant of the usual college degrees. Negotiations during the next few months led not merely to an amendment, but to the drawing up of an entirely new though frequently called an "additional" or "supplementary" Charter. In June 1755 there was again a procession of the Trustees to the Governor's mansion, this time accompanied by the Provost and Vice-Provost, as under the new Charter they were to be called, and the delivery to them of a formal document incorporating "The Trustees of the College, Academy and Charitable School of Philadelphia in the Province of Pennsylvania." The newspapers promptly reported that a "College in the most extensive sense of the word is erected in this city and added to that collection of Schools formerly called the Academy," and a

¹ Franklin to Smith, Nov., 27, 1753.

printed form of the "Additional Charter" soon appeared from the press of Franklin and Hall.

From the verbiage and repetitions of this document emerge five points: the appointment of a Provost teaching the philosophic branches and having general oversight of the students, and of a Vice-Provost who is to be head of the Latin School and also Rector of the Academy; the application of the higher title of "Professor" to all the old masters; the organization of a "Faculty" with at least some unity and influence; the grant of power to the Trustees, acting through the Provost or Vice-Provost, to admit students in the College and Academy and other persons to any degrees to which persons are usually admitted in either or any of the universities or colleges in Great Britain; and lastly the requirement, destined to make trouble later, that the Provost, Vice-Provost, Trustees, and professors must take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance to the British Crown.

One is struck by the adoption of the title "Provost" for the head of the College. The term was not used elsewhere in America, nor in Scotland, from which Smith came, at least in any educational sense, though it was the traditional title for heads of certain colleges at Oxford and in Ireland. The most likely explanation is that it was borrowed from Smith's *General Idea of the College of Mirania*, where it is used rather casually of the "head, whom they call Provost or Principal."¹ "President" was already appropriated to the head of the Board of Trustees, whose supremacy under their organization the Trustees might not wish to depreciate, and "Rector," familiar in early academic use, was attributed to the head of the Academy. Whatever the source of the title, the choice of William Smith to bear it was a critical decision. His prominence made it familiar, and gave it a distinction which it has never since lost.

The immediate effect of obtaining the new charter with the new name and the new powers it conveyed seems to have been a sense of exaltation, for almost immediately £500 was expended in rearranging the upper hall for the better accommodation of audiences of distinction; and £150 was appropriated for pur-

¹ This is the form in the first edition. In later editions, after Smith had himself become a Provost, the term was omitted from *Mirania*.

chase of apparatus for exhibiting experiments in natural philosophy.

The successive steps of fifteen formative years had now been taken: first had appeared the Trustees of 1740, with their New Building, their unrecorded acts and their unfulfilled trust; then the transfer of the building and the trust to the Trustees of 1749, and the inauguration, in 1751, of the Academy and the long-delayed Free School. In 1753 had come the grant of the first Proprietary charter, and now, under the second charter, in 1755, the fully organized College with its two dependencies, the Academy and the Charity School, fared forth through twenty-five distinguished years, till, like a ship under full sail, the Colonial institution grounded on the military and political shoals of the Revolution.

Before, however, entering upon a description of this period of the University's history, it seems proper to discuss the question of the date of its origin.

THE DATE OF ORIGIN

Chronology is one of the primitive interests of mankind; men dearly love dates. Yet there is probably no more inexact science. History is full of dates which have been assigned only to be first accepted, then disputed, reasserted, corrected, and finally abandoned. In fact there are many well-known events that can never be unequivocally dated. The year or day may be only approximate, or the testimony for it may be indecisive, or it may be one of several equally defensible dates, or it may be mythical altogether. Even those which are most familiar are sometimes ambiguous. The discovery of America may be attributed to Leif Ericson in 985 or to Columbus in 1492. American textbooks close our colonial period with July 4, 1776, when we asserted our independence, while English textbooks close it with 1783, when Great Britain acknowledged it. A.U.C., the year of the foundation of Rome, has been abandoned by modern scholars altogether.

There is always something conventional about an early date, however widely it may be accepted. It is like the source of a river.

A choice may be made, as we approach its headwaters, among a number of affluents. One may have a somewhat greater volume, another may flow more nearly in the direction of its later course, another may be actually longer; or it may rise in a lake which has equally contributory streams.

It is the same with the origin of universities. The dates given for the foundation of Oxford, Paris, Bologna, or Salamanca are notoriously traditional only. Harvard celebrated in 1936 with dignity and propriety her three-hundredth birthday, commemorating the year in which the Massachusetts General Court resolved that it would give, a year later, in 1637, £200 toward a "School or College," and another £200 when the work of establishing it should be completed. The legislative act of 1636 was what the most recent historian of Harvard aptly describes as "the first official and recorded step toward the establishment of the earliest collegiate foundation in the English colonies." But it was, as he observes, only a step. It was not till two years later that the alterations in an old dwelling house were made that gave the College a place in which to offer its earliest and soon interrupted courses, and the death of John Harvard gave it its first bequest and its name. Continuous teaching did not begin till four years later, and its charter was not given till 1650. The foundation of Harvard was evidently a progressive operation. William and Mary, duly chartered by the Crown in 1693, and claiming that as her date of origin, has an academic tradition that extends back to the grant of land for a "seminary of learning" by the Virginia Company in 1619; and still more specifically to 1660, when a similar grant for a "college" was made by the Provincial Assembly though not acted on till the later date.

As to Yale, although it was in 1701, the year usually given as that of her foundation, that the act of the Assembly of Connecticut incorporating it as a "Collegiate School" and authorizing it to give licenses which were equivalent to degrees was passed, its peripatetic and divided life for some years, successively at Branford and Saybrook, and separately at Wethersfield, before settling down in New Haven in 1716, might seem to require the choice of a later date. On the other hand the tentative steps toward the organization of a Connecticut college, taken long be-

fore, might justify an earlier one. The same is true of Princeton, on whose first charter, that of 1746, her official date of origin, a cloud has always rested since it was never recorded and no one knows its exact wording, though presumably it gave all the rights she claims. She also sojourned in Elizabeth and Newark before she settled in her permanent abiding place and justified her modern name. On the other hand an early historian of that institution, going further back, says "The College of New Jersey traces its origin to the great schism in the Presbyterian Church in America, which took place in 1741."¹ Indeed the history of the "Log College" and the long-discussed plans for the establishment of a Presbyterian college in New Jersey have been suggested, not without propriety, as reasons for a still earlier date. The discovery recently of documents which carry the history of the University of Delaware continuously back through the Academy in Newark to Alison's Academy in 1743, have led to the adoption of that as its date of origin by the modern institution. The incorporation, October 31, 1754, of King's College seems to give an unusually clear-cut date for the origin of what we now know as Columbia University, and with that date, with a modesty not always characteristic of the city of its location, it has always been satisfied, though a board of trustees to administer its affairs had been created three years earlier, in 1751, and certain land in the city had long been set apart for a future college. On the other hand it had no building of its own till 1760. The accepted date of origin in each of these cases is a sufficiently well-chosen one, which there is no occasion to criticize. But the fact remains that in each case the accepted date is a conventional one only, and another might have been settled upon instead. All that historical accuracy can demand—or indeed achieve—is that the reason for the choice shall be made clear.

There are six years, 1740, 1743, 1749, 1751, 1753, and 1755, for any one of which a case might be made out as the proper "date of origin" of the University of Pennsylvania. The significance of each has appeared in the narrative as given in the preceding pages. It will have been noted that 1740 is the date of the creation

¹ *Historical Sketch of the College of New Jersey*, anonymous, published Phila., 1859.

of the earliest of the many educational trusts the University has taken upon itself during the two hundred years of its life. It might be considered a lawyer's date; it is a familiar legal practice in considering the date of any institution to seek out the oldest trust it administers. As a matter of fact it was a learned judge who was the special proponent of the adoption of this date. The year 1743, when Franklin first drew up his plans for a college would have a stronger claim if he had only published the plan.

The year 1749 was the year of organization of the present Board of Trustees. On November 13 of that year the earliest entry was made in that long series of minutes which in its twenty-three portly volumes brings the record of administration down to the present day. It would, if chosen, be a secretary's date; in his opinion the life of an organization is to be found in the record of the actions of its administrators.

January 1751 instruction actually began. For the first time teacher and pupil faced each other as they were to do in due succession for the next two centuries. This would be a pedagogue's date; if the Faculty had been consulted on the matter this might have been the date officially chosen. To them it is teaching that makes the University.

The years 1753 and 1755 are the dates of the two successive Proprietary charters. By the first the Trustees were incorporated and given financial and administrative powers; by the second their educational powers were extended to the grant of academic degrees. These gave social standing and legal rights, prestige, and the full title the institution was to hold through the colonial period, "The College, Academy and Charitable School of Philadelphia in the Province of Pennsylvania." But the charters, from an educational point of view, regularized and legalized the existing activities of the institution; they did not initiate them. The year of the grant of either of the charters would be a formal rather than a realistic date. The year of the charter of an educational institution is apt to be the least significant of its early dates.

The official choice among these dates was not actually made at Pennsylvania till more than a hundred years after the latest of

them. As a matter of fact the origin of an institution seldom becomes a matter of interest till a certain stage of antiquity has been reached and a natural pride in its survival adds warmth to the cold records of chronology. Then someone remembers that the nation or the city or the society or the institution is half a century or a century or two or three centuries, or, in Italy or in China, a thousand years old, and an anniversary is celebrated accordingly. It is necessary therefore to anticipate our narrative in order to make clear the reason for the choice.

The question did not come up for any definitive discussion or official decision until 1885.¹ It was possibly suggested at that time by the Centennial Exposition of 1876, the precursor of so many centennial celebrations. In the University Catalogue for 1885-86 and continuously afterward for some years appeared a short "Historical Sketch."² In this much stress was laid on the part taken by Franklin in plans for higher education in Philadelphia and in the organization of the Board of Trustees of the Academy in 1749, with the intimation that this year was the proper date of origin.

In the fall of 1889, however, in a volume entitled *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania*, published by the United States Commissioner of Education in succession to a similar volume, *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia*, the view was expressed that the date should rather be 1740, when the trust for a free school, afterward carried out by the Trustees of the Academy and College, was created and the building which became its first home was erected. The author of this historical sketch in this volume remarks of the free school: "This may be said to be the beginning of the University of Pennsylvania." For the next ten years, till the final authoritative decision of the Board of Trustees in 1899, the date of the foundation of the University was under general discussion. Professor McMaster gave the weight of his historical knowledge and critical judgment to the view that the continuity of the free school trust

¹ The Alumni Society, formed in 1885, unfamiliar with the early history of the College, held a "centennial" celebration in 1849.

² This was prepared presumably by Jesse Y. Burk, then Secretary of the University.

through all subsequent changes "carries back the foundation of the institution now called the University to 1740."¹ The Provost accepted these statements and obtained the approval of the Board of Trustees for the publication of Professor Thorpe's volume, practically pledging them to that date. The historical sketch in the Catalogue for 1893-94, and subsequently, was changed so as to subordinate the 1749 date and to give prominence to that of 1740.²

The matter was brought to a head by the proposal in May 1899 to adopt a new seal for the University on which the date of its origin should be placed. A decision could be postponed no longer. Judge Pennypacker, a member of the Board of Trustees, was thereupon asked to make a formal report on the subject. He was a specialist in the early history of Pennsylvania, a collector of rare books and pamphlets in that field, and a robust Pennsylvanian in his general attitude. June 5, 1899, he read a carefully prepared "brief," as he called it, before a committee of the Board of Trustees, consisting of Charles C. Harrison, then Provost, the Bishop of Pennsylvania, a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, and two prominent business men. In this formal argument Judge Pennypacker laid stress on the fact that the exact form of words used to create the free school trust in 1740, "For the Instruction of Poor Children Gratis in Useful Literature and Knowledge of the Christian Religion," was used in the deed by which the Trustees of that school transferred their trust in 1749 to the Trustees of the Academy who finally fulfilled the duties their predecessors had failed to carry out. The same formula with but slight change of wording was used in the charters of 1753 and 1755 and in later acts of 1779, 1789, and 1791, showing that the trust had been a continuous one from 1740 to the date of the presentation of his

¹ The compiler of *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania* was Professor Francis N. Thorpe, a new and active member of the Faculty; and the writer of the historical sketch was John L. Stewart, a recent graduate. The correspondence on this matter is in the archives of the University.

² Late in 1898 a committee of the Society of the Alumni proposed to the Board of Trustees the celebration of the next year, 1899, as the sesquicentennial of the University, which would of course have involved the acceptance of the year 1749 as the foundation date. December 6, 1898, the Trustees resolved, as was obvious, that in the remaining few months there would not be time to prepare such a celebration, but that they would take up anew in a special meeting the question of the date.

argument. He quoted various contemporary writings indicating that the Charity School, the Academy, and the College were popularly looked upon as a single institution, the roots of which extended back into the free school, and gave his unqualified opinion that 1740 should be recognized as the date of origin.¹

The next day, June 6, 1899, the committee reported to the Board favorably on that date and the Board resolved that "the date of foundation heretofore affirmed, A.D. 1740, as that of this University is shown to be warranted," thus settling the matter, so far as official action could settle it. The new seal with that date upon it was thereupon approved, and thereafter it was used on official documents and publications until 1933, when in the interest of simplicity the date was omitted from the seal then adopted. The reader may draw his own conclusion as to the propriety of this choice among the possible dates of origin from the events of these early years as they have been told. Like all such choices it must be a conventional one; but apart from legal continuity, a choice that reflects so clearly the intellectual and philanthropic aspirations of the time will on further study probably not be considered inappropriate for the beginning of a great educational institution.

The fact that this date places Pennsylvania earlier in accepted origin than either of its two nearest compeers—Princeton, which has settled on 1746 as its foundation date, and Columbia, which has chosen 1754—has doubtless been a satisfaction to Pennsylvanians who, like all who live in a young country, are avid for antiquity and, like all who are nearly on an equality, are jealous of precedence. But in the eyes of the historian, searching for fundamental causes, these questions of a few years of priority or posteriority are somewhat irrelevant. Historians generally have little interest in beginnings, which they know to be usually only stages in growth. What is of real significance is that these three neighboring institutions, which were to grow to great universities in later times, came into existence to all intents and purposes simultaneously. There must have been in these middle years of the eighteenth century in this region some general cause especially conducive to bringing higher educational institutions to

¹ Report of the Provost, 1898-1899, pp. 209-23; also separately published.

the birth. There were also special conditions which characterized each. So far as the School, Academy, and College which were to become the University of Pennsylvania were concerned, this formative influence was without doubt the growing size, wealth, and intellectual ambition of the city in which it was so modestly established. This will come out even more clearly as its position in the life of colonial Philadelphia is described.

Chapter 3

THE COLONIAL COLLEGE

1755-1779

THE BUILDINGS

IN the tangle of warehouses, shops, and passageways that now cover the site of the colonial College at Fourth and Arch streets can still be recognized sufficient landmarks to give a sense of reality to the contemporary descriptions and sketches that have come down to us. After the original acquisition of May 1740, the purchase of additional lots to the south and north in 1750 and 1751, and extension of its property somewhat later to Arch Street, the College started its adult life in a tract extending some two hundred and eighty feet along Fourth Street and approximately two hundred feet back to the wall of Christ Church burying ground, whose memorial use and venerated occupancy keep it still undisturbed in the midst of change. Almost in the center of this lot stood the original New Building, now to be known indiscriminately as the Academy or the College. It was set far enough back from Fourth Street to have a short but dignified approach from a gateway in the brick wall that separated the grounds from the street, much as the older Friends' meeting-houses are regularly set back from the roadway.

The main doorway was in the middle of its long side directly opposite the gateway. The alteration of the building from its original form, that of a large auditorium, to College, Academy, and Charity School uses had involved dividing it into two stories and subdividing the first to provide a room for each of the "schools." From the entrance door small rooms opened to the right and left; a passageway led back to the large main room and,

turning to the left, gave access to a stairway to the second floor. A doorway opened to the back yard—the “campus” of those primitive times, whose quarter-acre of ground represented the only provision for the “running, leaping, wrestling and swimming” Franklin had recommended in the *Proposals*. We are told that the students made free use of the adjacent streets for the first of those exercises, and they doubtless went for the last to the nearby river, as we know their elders did. The second floor was a single hall of really fine proportions, approximately ninety feet long by seventy wide. Around three sides a continuous gallery, ceiled underneath, was built in 1755 and a dais was arranged at the north end sufficiently large to accommodate the rostrum and seats for Trustees, Faculty, distinguished guests, and student participants in academic exercises. In 1760 an organ was placed in the gallery at the south end of the room. The hall was well lighted by sixteen windows.

Notwithstanding the facilities both for living at home and for boarding available in a large city, difficulties existed connected with the high cost of living and with the unsupervised behavior of such students as were not living at home. Both Princeton and the college in New York offered examples of “a collegiate way of living.” These difficulties and the attraction of living together applied especially to students from the country districts, from other provinces and from the West Indies. A proposal was made in March 1761 for the erection of one or more additional buildings “for lodging and dieting a number of students.” The project was advocated with vigor by Alexander Stedman, a recent immigrant to Pennsylvania and a newly elected Trustee, a wealthy man, with an adventurous career behind him as a prisoner at Culloden and ahead of him as a successful lawyer, landholder, and judge, and ultimately, at the Revolution, an attainted Tory.

There was sufficient land, but the expense of entering upon a further building enterprise presented an obstacle. The natural recourse was a lottery, the habitual method at that time by which churches and schools raised funds for special needs. The conditions seemed favorable as the city was just then full of officers and strangers, during a lull in the French and Indian War, who might be expected to subscribe readily to a lottery for such a use-

ful purpose. A lottery was therefore initiated, and we hear that twenty thousand tickets had been sold by July of 1761. The two hundred not yet disposed of were drawn in the name of the Academy itself. But there had been considerable delay in settling the accounts of recent lotteries, and there was rising opposition to them. A committee appointed to consider the matter of new buildings approved the project but deplored the use of lotteries as "precarious and attended with much trouble to individuals," since some of the Trustees would be expected to take charge. They took occasion to propose placing the College "on a permanent and respectable footing for the Advancement of Learning forever," the continual aspiration of generations of college administrators, by appealing to the generosity of the public both in Pennsylvania and in England. This appeal led to an interesting series of events that will be discussed later.

In the meantime the Trustees entered cautiously upon the erection of the proposed residence building. The two principal professors visited Princeton to study the arrangements of Nassau Hall, the number of students it accommodated and the rates they paid. A year later the building was begun, to the north of the main building. In January 1765 public announcement was made that it was finished, already occupied by some of the older students and ready to admit others, "being ten or twelve years of age or upwards." Two rooms downstairs were allotted to the boys' Free School, and one to the girls; another was a kitchen, another a dining room. The two upper stories contained sixteen rooms in which fifty boarders could be accommodated "without being more crowded than in the Jersey College." One of the Faculty, Professor Kinnersley, acted as steward; there was a cook and his assistant. The charges for tuition, for the rooms, and certain fees were fixed; other expenses, "commons" etc., were to be proportioned among the occupants of the dormitory. Altogether it was anticipated that under these arrangements the total college expenses of youths in Philadelphia, living four in a room, would not much exceed £30, equivalent to about \$100 a year apiece.

Although this building was looked upon as a beginning only, no other dormitory or students' residence building was put up

during the colonial period. This one proved no great success. There were the usual, although apparently unjust, complaints of unsatisfactory food, unswept rooms, and insufficient care of the cleanliness of the smaller boys, "who could not be trusted by themselves." On the other hand it was stated that Mrs. Kinnersley sent for the younger boys twice a week, "to have their heads combed," and once a week to bring their dirty linen to be given out for washing. The effort to introduce the "collegiate way of living" in a large city presented difficulties that did not exist in a small town, and this venture came little by little to be no more than a supervised boarding home, a constant source of difficulty and expense to the Trustees. It was ultimately rented at a set sum to an outsider who made his own terms with the student boarders. In 1765 the Trustees purchased two small houses fronting on Fourth Street which had long been felt to be an intrusion on what was otherwise an unbroken College tract, and gave the use of them to two of the professors as an addition to their small salaries.

In 1774 Provost Smith was approaching the twentieth year of his service to the College. He lived at the Falls of Schuylkill and found going to and fro, often, as he says, five or six times a day, burdensome, as well he might; it was a matter of three miles or more. His family was growing; he had seven children, and the costs of living were rising. His salary of £350 was exiguous to say the least, and he had never asked for an increase, though he claims to have been instrumental in securing altogether some £14,000 for the College. He was convinced that "in any other liberal program" his financial situation would by this time be easy. He asks the Trustees therefore to build him a house on the College grounds, free occupancy of which with his salary will put him, as he says with some irony, "at least nearly on an equal footing with gentlemen in like station in neighboring seminaries." As to the means at the disposal of the Trustees, he remarks, with undoubted truth, though not perhaps with relevancy, referring to his own rising literary reputation: "In this growing country more resources will be always opening to us if we preserve the reputation of this Seminary as a Place of Letters." The Trustees by unanimous vote agreed to his proposal,

selected the corner of Fourth and Arch streets as the location, and ordered the erection of a brick house of respectable size and design, with three stories and semi-detached kitchen in the usual style of Philadelphia houses of moderate pretensions at that time. It was finished two years later. Part of its back bay window is still visible. It became our first "Provost's House." Dr. Smith moved in promptly; the colorful story of his ejection a few years later is part of Revolutionary history. In the meantime around the two College buildings and the three dwelling houses of the professors, forming a compact group, the life of the colonial College revolved.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Even after paying for the alteration of the New Building for its educational uses and the purchase of the original equipment of books and apparatus, expenses went steadily on, as is their way. In addition to the salaries of professors and tutors, multitudinous small costs had to be met. The students were expected to pay for the firewood that kept them and the masters warm, but it had to be hauled and cut, and its use necessitated frequent sweeping of the chimneys, all of which the authorities had to pay for. There was constant expenditure for broken windows—responsibility for which, then as now, was hard to fix. In the early days several pounds a year were paid one of the professors for the service of his Negro servant in ringing the college bell twice a day. The ground rents on which the College land had been bought seemed small, but piled up steadily and were frequently in arrears. Expenditures were evidently watched carefully, for a proportionate deduction of the rent was made for the eleven days dropped from the year 1752 when the reformation of the calendar was made. No amount of care, however, could prevent the need for meeting ordinary academic expenses. Payments for quills and ink, which were furnished the students gratis, amounted to astonishing sums, although one of the tutors in the English school had the special duty of preparing the pens. In 1763 the treasurer's account shows "for quilles and ink" £19. 16s.; in 1764, "for Quilles and Ink," £17. 17s. 6d. After the

original purchase of equipment in London in 1750 money is spent from time to time on books and appliances; as in 1755, £150 sterling on "apparatus for exhibiting Philosophical Experiments"; in 1773, £500 is paid to the widow of Professor Kinnersley for his collection of electrical apparatus. Payments for printing theses and for binding grammars appear later; a payment in 1774 of £24 for fourteen hogsheads of rum imported remains a mystery.

It was of course the salaries of masters and tutors that made the heaviest drain on the finances. These were certainly not excessive; they were nevertheless substantial. There were: £200 for the Provost, rising to £300 by 1770,¹ £200 for the Latin master, £150 each for the English and mathematical masters, payments of various sums to six or seven tutors or ushers in the various schools, and £30 a year for the master of the Boys' and the same for the mistress of the Girls' Charity School. The salary list came therefore to between £1,200 and £1,500 a year. Altogether the annual expenses of the College amounted to about £2,000. Usually there was some new building in progress.

What income could be counted on to meet these expenses? The stream of special contributions which had flowed so freely for the first few years had soon run dry, and there were only isolated and infrequent gifts, such as the £300 given by a tradesman of the city in 1759, the income of which was to be paid to him as an annuity during his lifetime, the principal to go to the College on his death.² There were also one or two earmarked sums, the interest of which was to be given to students as prizes. The Trustees were for the most part successful merchants, but there was one great difference between carrying on their mercantile affairs and administering the affairs of the College. Expenditure for the former was reimbursed by sales in at least an equal, normally in a greater amount; expenditure for the College brought no such returns. It was doubtless due to the impression this fact made upon them that the treasurer's accounts during the colonial period give no single instance, after the first five years, of a money contribution from any member of the

¹ Dr. Smith received an extra payment of £50 from the Proprietaries.

² Minutes, 14 Dec. 1759, Jan. 8, 1760.

Board of Trustees. They evidently did not suffer as did their successors, long afterward, described by a witty Trustee as emerging from a Board meeting "like Marco Bozzaris, bleeding at every vein."

With as yet no income-producing investments, the Trustees began their administration, after the exhaustion of the initial contributions, with only the fees of the students and such casual sources of funds as they could discover, or such devices as they could invent, to meet the expenses of the College, Academy, and Charity School. The dictum of Adam Smith, the great contemporary economist, a friend of Franklin, that higher education is one activity of society that can never pay for itself but must always be subsidized, was justified here as it has been elsewhere. The entrance and tuition fees of students had been set at £4 a year. From a group of somewhat less than two hundred paying students, and the number never rose appreciably above this, there would be obtained somewhere between £500 and £800 a year.¹ In 1757 an attempt was made to raise the tuition in the upper classes to £10 a year, but this was found to be £6 higher than the charge in rival colleges, and six months later the old rate was restored.

The one-hundred-odd pupils of the Charity School by the terms of the trust paid nothing. On the other hand there was much popular sympathy with that particular dependency of the College. The collections from a sermon preached by Mr. Peters in favor of this School in 1752, and from two sermons by Whitefield in 1754 and 1764, the proceeds of an entertainment at which the pupils of the Free School sang, given by the students of the Academy and their friends in 1765,² and a sum of a hundred pounds somewhat hesitatingly accepted by the Trustees in 1754 from a company of comedians who had on their own initiative acted a play for the benefit of the Charity School, went far to meet its expenses. At the Commencement of 1764 Provost Smith made an appeal to the audience for this charitable object, and after the exercises two of the Trustees stood at the gate to

¹ In the year 1757 the fees amounted to £548. 10s.; for 1758 to £746. 10d.; for 1761 £763. 15s. 10d.; Treasurer's Accounts.

² *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 4 and April 11, 1765.

receive "the free-will offerings of pious and well-disposed persons." The collection produced £40.

The Trustees estimated in 1762 that the expenses of the whole institution amounted to about £700 more than its regular income. There seemed no possibility of balancing its budget from regular sources. The familiar recourse at this time, as already remarked, was to a lottery. It was an age of lotteries, especially for churches, schools, and public works. Presumably those who purchased tickets felt that they were making a contribution to a pious cause and might at the same time have the satisfaction of getting their contribution back with an augmentation. In 1746 a provincial act was passed in New York authorizing a lottery for a future college, a sort of prenatal provision for Columbia's ultimate support. In 1747, when war was anticipated, the funds for constructing the earthworks to defend Philadelphia were raised by a lottery. In 1752 the vestry of Christ Church appointed twelve of their members to manage a lottery for building the towers of the church and buying the bells and a clock. Later both St. Peter's and the Second Presbyterian church were completed with lottery funds. In 1750 Yale put up a new building with the proceeds of a lottery; in 1772 Harvard secured funds for building Stoughton Hall, and long afterward for Holworthy by the same means. Philadelphia was especially given to lotteries; even those for the benefit of institutions in other places were often floated in Philadelphia, probably because of its numerous and well-to-do population and because during war times the city was a military base and drew together a spendthrift population. In 1750 the young college of Princeton floated a lottery in Philadelphia, and in 1759 another is advertised there to build a church in New Brunswick. Similarly lotteries were utilized to build bridges, improve navigation, pave streets. Many of the Trustees of the College and Academy had been trusted officers in these lotteries.

It is therefore not a matter of surprise that in 1757, when finances pinched, the Trustees began a course of obtaining money in this way. Two lotteries were successively launched in that year, and when their accounts were closed proved to have produced nearly £4,000 currency. Afterward there was no year till

1764 that did not see the drawing of a lottery for the College. There were in all seven drawings, covering the years from 1757 to 1764, and they netted a total of more than £9,000. There was nevertheless objection to the practice on moral grounds. There had been frequent legislation against it, but the laws were either disallowed in England or became a dead letter in the province. In 1759 there were many petitions to the Assembly to prohibit lotteries, and although it was generally supposed that these emanated from persons hostile to the College, since it drew its support from that source, a law was passed "For more effectual Suppressing and Preventing of Lotteries and Plays," and for the moment the College withdrew its announcement. But this law also was abrogated by the King, and the College continued this profitable if dubious policy for five more years.¹

In 1761 another and less questionable means of raising funds was suggested by Provost Smith. This was that the Provost should be sent to England and Scotland to seek contributions for the College and Academy. This was as characteristic of the times as were the lotteries, and more respectable. The faith of the colonials in the willingness of the mother country to aid them, from its wealth, in religious and charitable ways was profound, and largely justified. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was supporting many missions in America, four within the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia, and had given assistance to the two Anglican churches in the city in their early needs. The young Academy had already received some aid from charitable Englishmen, as well as from the Penn family. The committee on ways and means of 1761 approved the Provost's proposal and expressed the belief that "there are thousands that want nothing more than opportunities of showing their beneficence and good will to anything calculated for the Benefit of these Colonies."

The plan seemed the more promising in that Dr. Smith already had so many valuable contacts in England. At the very beginning of his career when, as a young man of twenty-six, he had gone to England to be ordained, he became well known to the Arch-

¹ For the practice of lotteries see Trustees' Minutes, esp. 13 Jan. 1761; Amer. Hist. Asso. Report for 1892, pp. 171-195; Scharf & Westcott, *History of Philadelphia*, Phila., 1884, I, 255; Asa E. Martin in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vols. 47, 48; T. H. Montgomery, *op. cit.*, pp. 377-79.

bishop of Canterbury and was by him introduced to Thomas Penn, the elder of the two brothers who now constituted the Proprietary government of Pennsylvania. During the eight months he had spent there on a second visit, in 1758, he had gained scholastic promotion and enjoyed social recognition. At the request of Dr. Chandler, principal of his own University of Aberdeen, and now the leader of the Dissenting body in Scotland and England, that University gave him the degree of Doctor of Divinity and, on the recommendation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops, he was given the same degree by Oxford. Several of his sermons delivered on public occasions and already printed in America were gathered in a volume and issued in London. They received some mild complimentary notice from English critical journals. He wrote home that he had a promise in London of £1,000 for the College. He had repeated interviews with Thomas Penn and the Archbishop of Canterbury and with the prominent people, ecclesiastical and lay, who made up the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He was also an adviser to the newly organized body of Trustees for the establishment of schools among the German settlers in Pennsylvania, designed to protect them from Popery and French influence, a plan as respectable in England as it was unpopular in America.

It might fairly be anticipated therefore that an appeal in England for help for the College and Academy would be an effective one. The Provost was thereupon provided with written authority to make collections and with formal instructions by the Trustees and, leaving his wife of six months expecting a child, and his newly built house at Falls of Schuylkill, he set sail for the third time for England. It may be remarked here how common was the going to and fro between England and Pennsylvania, and doubtless the same was true of the other colonies. Two of the Trustees of the College were in England at the time, and another was to go over the next year; a recent graduate visited the Provost in London and at least two were at the time in Edinburgh studying medicine. The Provost left Philadelphia in January 1762 and was away for two years and a half, returning in May 1764. Except for a short visit to his father and his old university in Scotland and six months in Ireland, most of which

time he was ill, his whole time during this long period was occupied with the collection of funds. He moved among aristocratic people. Thomas Penn was his constant friend. With Lady Juliana his wife, Penn came to Ireland after Smith's illness and took him home to recuperate. He saw much of the two archbishops, of several of the bishops, and of Dr. Chandler. He met many of the statesmen of the day, Bute and Pitt, members of the Privy Council and officials of the counties and towns, and of the universities. By Penn, along with John Inglis, the Trustee, and Samuel Powell, the recent graduate already referred to, he was presented to the young King, George III, who treated them pleasantly, asked about the College and the progress of the collection and ordered a donation of £200 to the fund.

Early in the progress of the campaign the Provost was met by two disappointments. One was the appearance of a rival in the field in the person of James Jay of New York, who called on him in his lodgings in London to say that as he was visiting England on some personal business the trustees of his college, King's of New York, had commissioned him to make a collection of funds for it in Great Britain. Dr. Smith's annoyance was not diminished by the remembrance that he had talked about the object of his mission when he had passed through New York six months before, and a suspicion that the trustees of the New York institution had borrowed the idea from him. However there was nothing to do except agree to work in common. Rivalry in their appeal would be fatal to both, and neither was willing to divide the country into spheres of influence.

The second disappointment was the urgency of his English friends that he should proceed in the collection by way of what was called a royal brief. He would have much preferred to go directly to the people of influence whom he knew and to those to whom these would give him introductions, relying on his own persuasiveness and the excellence of his cause; but he could not disregard the advice of the Archbishop and Thomas Penn. In order to regularize public subscriptions for charitable and religious purposes a law had been passed in the reign of Queen Anne, providing for the issue by the King, on the advice of the Privy Council, of a royal brief, a document under the great seal,

directed to every clergyman in England, requiring him to ask contributions from his parishioners and to pay over the resulting sums to the possessors of the brief. This had become a frequent, indeed for the prospects of any one collection, only too frequent a proceeding, and seldom now produced more than a thousand pounds.

Under the circumstances, the only practicable policy was for Dr. Smith to join forces with Mr. Jay and apply to the King in Council for a joint brief. This was readily obtained, the Archbishop taking the happy opportunity of a meeting of the Privy Council with the King on the occasion of the birth of his son, the future George IV, to urge the president of the Council to recommend the grant, which the King readily acceded to. The brief involved all the formalities and delays and expenses usually accompanying official action, but eventually eleven thousand five hundred copies, sealed and placed in the hands of "brief-layers" accompanied by a letter of appeal from Dr. Smith were distributed to that number of parishes in England. A chance copy still lies among the University archives. The division of proceeds between the two colleges was to be equal; the only concession Smith obtained was that his institution, as the older, was always to be named first. As an offset to this the King's gift to Mr. Jay's fund was £400, twice what he had given Dr. Smith, on the ground that the Philadelphia college had a generous patron in Mr. Penn, while the New York institution had no patron but himself. To the collection by brief the Provost had been perforce converted, but he complained of its preventing him and Jay from appealing directly to "the middling rank of people," since they would be the natural contributors through the parish clergy and must not therefore be approached. It was a grand scheme from the publicity point of view, and the colleges in Philadelphia and New York became, certainly for a while, better known in England than they have ever been since.

If the sodden mass of English poverty was necessarily unproductive and the middle classes were covered by the brief, it was still possible for Smith and Jay to appeal directly to the wealthy. This they did with considerable success. In addition to the King's gift they received from the two Proprietaries £500. Lady Curzon,

after listening to one of Dr. Smith's eloquent sermons in Mayfair Chapel, gave £100. The Princess Dowager of Wales gave another £100, a Mr. Dawkins gave £50, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Pitt, and several of the Oxford colleges, various sums. The long list of these and of the parish contributions that was duly sent home and still lies among the College papers testifies to the widespread interest and willingness to subscribe even in small sums to the distant colonial colleges whose claims were put with so much force and ingenuity by its Provost and his colleague. Among subscribers are Baptist and Methodist congregations, but no Quaker meetings, doubtless a reflection of the contests in the far-off colony. Mr. Garrick offered the free use of Drury Lane Theatre for an evening, and Beard of Covent Garden, with a group of his performers and the boys from the Royal Chapel, volunteered to give a benefit oratorio. The opening of Vauxhall for the season was postponed so as not to interfere with this performance. Of course Dr. Smith had the usual experience with wealthy prospective givers, finding that they were "so harassed with an infinity of appeals" that even after an introduction had been obtained they had to be visited "twenty times" before a gift was actually secured.

As the collection proceeded a more subtle difficulty arose. In the original discussion concerning an appeal to England it had been the hope of the Trustees, indeed their expressed intention, though it was not mentioned in Dr. Smith's instructions or in his own public appeal for funds, that the sums collected should be an endowment, the income of which, with the fees of the students, would pay the regular expenses of the College. This intention was seized upon by the managers of the brief and insisted upon by the authorities in England on all occasions, and Dr. Smith accepted it. On the other hand the College Trustees, confronted with an empty treasury, harried by debts, burdened with the building costs of the new dormitory and subjected to the delays of distance and procrastination, showed signs of an intention to use the proceeds of the collection, as they came in, for immediate purposes. A year after Dr. Smith's departure they wrote him describing their bad financial condition, complaining of the slow returns from the last lottery, and asking him how

much they might draw and how soon from his collections. Dr. Smith's reminder that the money he is collecting is only to be used "to raise a capital" they resent, with virtuous indignation that they should be accused of failing to keep their promise, and they declare that the £1,500 they have up to this time received has been duly lent on bond and mortgage at six per cent. But the suspicion of the English donors evidently still continues, for a dozen letters of reminder and defense are sent to and fro, and Dr. Smith complains that he has a difficult part to play between the Trustees and those with whom he is working in England. Thomas Penn writes in April 1764, shortly before Smith's return, that the £500 subscribed by the Proprietaries, as well as all other sums collected in England, should "be secured so as always to remain a fund the interest of which only, or the produce of land purchased with that money, may be applied to the support of the College." The issue came to be confused with the question whether or not new buildings were to be considered an investment in this sense, and remained long unsettled. In 1778 the Trustees declared that the principal donors were satisfied with the methods that were taken to lay out and preserve the money, but long afterwards the Trustees still found it necessary to insist that "Dr. Smith's collection had been treated as a capital fund." There were suspicions in Pennsylvania, probably quite unjustifiable, that the English church authorities were planning to use their money power to alter the non-sectarian character of the College.

The division of the collections with Jay through the brief gave to each of the participants £5,936. 10s. 6d., a quite unprecedented sum to be derived from such a source. With the special gifts, the total product of Dr. Smith's campaign in England amounted to £6,921. 7s. 6d. sterling, about £12,000 Pennsylvania currency. There were some necessary deductions, and it was long before the accounts were all cleared up. This was by far the largest sum received by the College at any one time, a considerably greater amount than that obtained from the series of lotteries between 1757 and 1764. Successful as the collection was, however, in the estimation of the time and in later tradition, it may be doubted whether in the long run it was a benefit to

the College. It bound more firmly the bonds that connected the College with the Proprietors and therefore with the Proprietary party in Pennsylvania; it drew it closer to England and so weakened it for the day when loyalty to the Crown was to become disloyalty to the new state and nation. Franklin is said to have expressed the opinion that the College could have secured sufficient support in Pennsylvania if it had not been so subservient to the Proprietors. Nor did the product of the collection relieve the institution from its necessities, for the years immediately following Dr. Smith's return in 1764 were apparently no less years of scarcity than those that had preceded them, and one of the criticisms made of the College fifteen years later was its hopeless financial condition. If the £12,000 reported by Dr. Smith could have been kept intact and safely invested at the prevailing rate of six per cent interest it would have just covered the annual deficit in running expenses as reported by the Trustees in 1760, but neither of these conditions, prompt investment or safety, was an actuality.

The plan of seeking support from other parts of the British Empire had, nevertheless, shown its possibilities. There were close commercial and social relations between Philadelphia and Charleston, the wealthiest city of the South, where Franklin had established one of his branch printing houses. These relations were made the basis of a collecting trip by Dr. Smith in 1771. The initial obstacle of an empty College treasury was overcome by a loan of £50 from one of the Trustees to meet the Provost's expenses on the trip. Unexpected difficulties disclosed themselves on his arrival. One was that the South Carolinians had at the time a proposal before their Provincial Council to establish a college of their own. Their plan was to put up the buildings by private subscription and provide for salaries and other running expenses by a tax. People in Charleston assured him that they "love Philadelphia as a place they have chief connection with on this continent," and if there had been any great catastrophe there or had the College been burnt or blown down they would be the most benevolent of neighbors; but they could not see the propriety of giving away money to another place which they wanted to use for the same purpose for themselves. Their plan

for a college did not as a matter of fact materialize; if it had, it would have been the pioneer of all the state universities, which have usually been established on a similar half-private, half-public basis. The Provost also discovered, to his surprise, that he had come at the wrong season of the year. The South Carolina aristocracy gathered at Charleston in the summer. In November, December, and January, when he was there, they were scattered on their country estates. Nevertheless he was well received. He was soon able to report that he had collected £700 sterling, and in February took home with him, mostly in commercial bills of exchange, more than £1,000 colonial currency.

The West Indies were the wealthiest part of the Empire, and with them also Philadelphia was in constant contact. Vessels arriving from or clearing for Jamaica, Barbadoes, St. Kitts and elsewhere were reported in every issue of the city newspapers. Evidence of an interest in the Philadelphia institution is found in a letter from Antigua dated 1756, making inquiry about the College from a gentleman of that place who plans to send his two sons there. "From the character he has heard of" the Philadelphia Academy he considers it "much preferable to the English schools as he believes they will be brought on faster and not learn the vices that our young Creoles bring with them from England."¹ It may have been knowledge of such an attitude in the West Indies which, soon after Dr. Smith's return from North Carolina, led the Trustees to seek a representative who might make a journey to the islands to collect funds. They found him in Dr. John Morgan, the restless founder of the medical courses of the College, who informed them that he was willing to make the trip. From Jamaica, his first port of call, he sent back a surprising proposal. This was that the Trustees should dispose of their old group of buildings and start a new college. He had found much interest in the recently founded medical courses, and some of the donors asked especially to have their subscriptions used for that school. He was sure he could obtain larger sums of money for a new and larger institution. The Trustees replied declaring that they felt themselves bound by their announced use of such funds as should be collected to carry on the

¹ Pemberton Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vol. XI, p. 46.

present foundation both in a material and a scholarly sense. Morgan wrote that he had hardly expected them to approve the plan. The proposal was thereupon dropped. The collection was proceeding reasonably well when, in the fall of 1772, a typical Caribbean hurricane swept through the West Indies, sparing Jamaica, it is true, but causing such losses through the other islands that the Trustees called Dr. Morgan home as soon as he could find passage, considering it improper to solicit funds from a community whose losses had been so great that they were themselves forced to ask for aid. Nevertheless Dr. Morgan was able to bring back with him when he returned in 1773 some £860.

The Trustees of this period showed an unwonted confidence in local generosity, for at the time they sent Morgan to the West Indies, they also appointed a committee to solicit funds in Philadelphia itself, and an appeal for the purpose was inserted in the newspapers. This action may have been suggested by the receipt of £100 in March 1772 from a Philadelphia merchant, Thomas Robeson, one of the few individual gifts received after the first subscriptions.

Some of the fresh funds were spent in 1771 in building a handsome wall around the College grounds, with an iron gate, to correspond to those which still give protection and entrance to the adjoining graveyard. The next year £320 of the £1,000 Dr. Smith had collected in South Carolina was devoted to the already mentioned purchase of two houses for the use of masters. Another part was invested in some lands and mills known as "Norriton," taking their name, as did the neighboring village of Norristown, from Isaac Norris, an extensive landowner in that neighborhood.

There was another piece of property which wanders like a wraith through fifty years and more of the history of the College and University. When Dr. Smith returned from his English trip in 1758 he brought back with him, as a gift from Thomas Penn, a deed for one-quarter of the Manor of Perkasie. The Penn family, it will be remembered, were not only the governors of Pennsylvania, they were by grant of the Crown owners of its soil. It was part of their land policy to reserve from immediate sale certain large tracts to be disposed of at a later time. These were

the so-called "manors," though no judicial organization was given them and they remained mere tracts of land to be sold or rented as occasion offered. By bequest and subdivision among the sons of William Penn, the ownership of one-quarter of Perkasie, containing about 2,500 acres, had fallen to Thomas Penn. It was a pleasant farming region in Berks County, some thirty miles from Philadelphia, through which the Perkiomen Creek still winds its tree-bordered way. Of this Penn in 1758 made a gift to the College, at the same time discontinuing the £50 annual allowance he had made since the grant of the first charter. It was not an unrestricted gift, for when the Trustees sent two of their members up to examine it and they advised that it be sold and the money invested in some other way, Penn objected and insisted on its retention. Familiar as he was with the unearned increment on land that had enriched the Cambridge and Oxford colleges, the London gilds and other English corporations, he conceived, naturally, of the same possibility in Pennsylvania. Yet considered as an investment it was at that time a doubtful asset. The arrival of British troops in the province on their way to the frontier, where the French and Indian War was in progress, had made money plentiful; if sold at once the tract might sell for £3,000, which invested would bring in more than three times the annual grant of £50 which it superseded; if retained as an investment by the College it was likely to be, as proved to be the case, a source of constant trouble. The Penns continued their opposition to its sale for two generations. It remained in the hands of the Trustees for more than fifty years; almost a hundred entries on their minutes are devoted to the troubles of Perkasie Manor from squatters, mortgages in arrears and foreclosed, unpaid rents and broken leases, which testify to the disappointment and the time lost in administering an unprofitable possession. In 1778 the income from it was but £134. 5s. in depreciated colonial currency.

In the year 1778 a formal statement of the financial affairs of the Academy and College was demanded by the Provincial Assembly. It was an unfortunate moment, when the depreciation of the currency due to the war was already bearing hard on all bodies with fixed incomes. Many of the mortgages held by the

College had recently been paid off in the depreciated money, and it was difficult to reinvest it safely. In any case the financial record of the College was a poor one. After some fifty years of corporate existence it could show, as real estate, only the group of College buildings, dwellings, and dormitories, and some properties rented but bringing in only some £225 a year, against which were ground rents of £64; the Manor of Perkasie, which, as stated above, was supposed to bring in £134 a year, and the Norristown land and mills which were rented for five hundred bushels of wheat a year. Money at interest was scarcely over £5,000, bringing in £300; the tuition from the students was estimated at £2,000 annually, and for the last three years about £1,200 a year had been paid or promised as contributions. The College was not bankrupt, but its finances were far from that hoped-for and always receding state when its income from investments would, along with the students' fees, cover its expenses. Instead it closed its colonial history with a deficit.

THE CURRICULUM

It is often forgotten in college histories that the object of a college is to educate its students. The author of this work does not wish to become so involved in origins and buildings and finances and other matters of antiquarian interest that he fails to give the history of education at Pennsylvania. Yet its records are singularly scanty. We know more about what went on elsewhere than about what went on in the classrooms. We hear more about all the other activities of Trustees, professors, and students than about the scholastic equipment provided, the textbooks they used, the lectures they gave or listened to, the books they read, what, if anything, the students actually learned. The story has to be put together from quite inadequate material. Even the nomenclature of academic life in the eighteenth century is remote and confused and the picture blurred. The College was a three years' course of advanced studies, making up the "Philosophical School," superimposed upon a group of other "schools" making up the Academy. A "school" was primarily a room in which a master or professor of a given subject and his assistants,

when he had any, taught the students who were enrolled in his "school" and such students as were sent to him for instruction from other "schools." The students were always listed separately in one or other of the "schools." A list in 1757 names twelve students in the Philosophical School, that is to say in the College, sixty in the Latin School, thirty-one in the English School, and twenty-two in the Mathematical School. A somewhat later list gives thirty-three in the Philosophical School, twenty-one in the Latin School, twenty-six in the English School, and forty-six in the Mathematical School. There were besides, the Writing School, and, occasionally and for various periods, schools for the modern languages, for drawing, for natural history and for other subjects; and there were of course the Boys' and Girls' Charity or Free Schools.

A school was, as has been said, a room. The Trustees order that a stove be placed in each school, that the schools be swept out regularly, that the students of other schools go by some regular arrangement to the Writing School for instruction in penmanship; they lend the Latin School to a Mr. Prefontaine to teach French. This is the sense in which the term is used for the Divinity Schools at Oxford, the rooms in which examinations are held. When the Trustees adjourn a meeting to visit the Philosophical School or the English School or the Writing School, they gather in that room to observe the teaching or the physical condition of the school or perhaps to look over the students' notebooks in the subject taught there, or to listen to their recitations. One of the early Trustees speaks of the institution as "a collection of schools under one roof and the inspection of the Trustees," and at another time as "this academical collection of schools."

The word, however, gradually loses this material sense and becomes synonymous with department or field of study, as we still speak of the Law School, the Medical School, or the Wharton School, though each may have a number not only of rooms but of buildings and a score or more of professors. It was in the Philosophical School in the former sense that the College led its existence, for it was in Dr. Smith's room in the early days that the older students gathered, were enrolled and were instructed

by him and his assistants in philosophy and in their other higher subjects of study. They received their classical and mathematical instruction in the respective schools or rooms devoted to those subjects or, in some cases, in their own by visiting masters from the other schools. It is with this Philosophical School or department that we have specially to deal, for it was the College and it was by accretions to it that the University came into being.

Except for the inseparable admixture of the affairs of Academy and College during colonial times and for some time afterward, our attention might be directed solely to the Philosophical School and its development; but for the sake of clarity a few words must first be given to the schools below the College, that is, to the Academy. The Latin or Classical or Grammar School, for it was called by all these terms indiscriminately, and the English School were rivals from the beginning. The former hardly represented the ideas of Franklin, so deeply was it modified by his concessions to his classically educated colleagues; the latter represented ideas more purely his own. The Latin School became, under the influence of the Provost, its successive masters and tutors, and with the sympathy of the most influential Trustees, more and more completely a classical course. It was under the general charge of Dr. Alison, the Vice-Provost, until increasing duties in the College demanded all his time. After this two successive professors of Latin, John Beveridge till 1768, and James Davidson till 1779, with one or more tutors, taught the school and gave some assistance in the classics to students in the College.

The tutors or ushers in the Latin School were of more than passing interest. They were usually well qualified; according to the observation of one of their pupils, Alexander Graydon, often better fitted for their work than the master of the school. They showed, however, a strong tendency to abandon their laborious work and exiguous salary for better positions as schoolmasters or to become clergymen or to study law or to turn to "other business," as one of them expresses it. They were apt to be recent graduates of the College or even students in their senior year. The very earliest of these tutors, serving from the beginning to 1755, was Charles Thomson, the lifelong friend and correspondent of Franklin, Secretary of Congress from 1774 to the end of

the war, and of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He became a well-known literary personage in Philadelphia, and in his old age made a complete translation of the Bible. Another destined to greatness was James Wilson, the later Justice. Others attained local prominence: Jacob Duché, as Rector of Christ Church and Chaplain of Congress, and others.

Of the two successive masters, Beveridge was a Scotchman with a strong accent, who had taught school in Edinburgh and in Wales before coming to this country, a good Latinist in prose and verse, but a poor disciplinarian; quick with the rattan and ferule, undignified in manner, and unable apparently to gain either the respect or the affection of his pupils. As there were at one time eighty-four boys in his school, with but one tutor, disorder was inevitable. In 1762 he appealed to the Trustees, saying that his difficulties were largely due to two causes: one that there were no rules for the government of his school, the other that no proper Latin grammar book was available. Two members of the Board were thereupon appointed to arrange with the Faculty for the choice of a Latin grammar and its publication. It was an unfortunate experiment. Whittenhall's *Latin Grammar* was chosen as the basis of the new book with alterations and additions arranged by Mr. Peters of the Trustees and Professor Beveridge himself. An edition of five hundred copies was produced by a local printer. The book was, however, so full of typographical errors that a devoted but fun-loving alumnus, Francis Hopkinson, whose name has appeared and will appear in many connections in this work, published *Errata, or the Art of Printing Incorrectly*, which purported to be a key to the *Grammar*, pointing out 151 blunders in 137 pages and claiming sarcastically that *Errata* was a specimen of a new kind of literature.

Professor Davidson's career was more successful if less picturesque than that of his predecessor, and carries the history of his school down to and indeed beyond the Revolution. The Latin School became practically a classical school preparing for entrance to the College, much like the Boston Latin School and other contemporary schools of the same type. It provided most of the recruits for the College, though of course many entered

from other places. One of the few intimate glimpses we get of the Latin School, apart from the usual stories of schoolboy mischief, is far from inspiring; as it comes from one who was himself dissatisfied, it may be unfair. Alexander Graydon, who was fourteen when he left, says of the latter part of his time there,

We were to a great degree impatient of the restraints of a school. . . . One boy thought he had Latin enough, as he was not designed for a learned profession. . . . Another was of opinion that he might be much better employed in a counting house . . . he cheerfully renounced the learned professions for the sake of the supposed liberty that would be the consequence. We were all, therefore, to be merchants, as to be mechanics would be too humiliating, and accordingly when the question was proposed which of us would enter upon the study of Greek, the grammar of which tongue was about to be put into our hands, there were but two or three who declared for it . . . I was thoroughly tired of books and confinement.

Notwithstanding his mother's advice and even entreaties Graydon refused to go on into the College, "to my lasting regret." Many boys spent some time at the Academy and then, like Graydon, left before entering college classes. Of several of those usually counted "Pennsylvania men," this is true. The lines between school and college and between college years were less clearly marked than now. A boy who did pass on to the higher grade, "Neddy" Burd of Lancaster, writing April 28, 1765, describes his alarm at being summoned according to the custom of the time to be examined for promotion before the Trustees. "We were conducted to the Electricity room, where the Rev. Mr. Duché, Mr. Stedman, Dr. Alison, & Mr. Beveridge were assembled . . . we were examined in Horace & lastly in Homer." After some further formalities they are the next day informed that "On account of your yesterday's extraordinary performance ye are admitted into Colledge." He evidently matured rapidly under college conditions, because but two years later he is giving his opinions on the theatre, dancing, and the races; he is fonder of Mr. Allyn than Mr. Hallam although the common opinion places the latter higher, and he tells his sister that his friend Jemmy Willing (they are both sixteen) is "almost tired" of the Assembly "because the Girls are so little."

Of the two lower schools the Latin School was undoubtedly the favored child of the Trustees; the English School but their stepchild. Even more distinctly than the Latin School it lay below the College; it was merely a branch of the Academy. Yet it represented not only the original ideas of Franklin, as expressed in his *Idea of an English School* of 1750 but, with some extensions, what he would willingly have had the whole College—a high-grade training school for citizenship, based on studies in the English language. But, as he tells us, he was outvoted in the Board of Trustees, and it remained a mere dependency, undervalued by most of them, while Franklin himself, absent in Europe almost continuously after 1757, was not in a position to insist on its proper support and the encouragement it needed.

At the outset of the career of the English School the Trustees were met by a problem that has faced them many times since, what to do about a member of the Faculty of undoubted ability, usefulness, and popularity, who would not conform to their requirements. There had arrived in Philadelphia from England, in 1750, where he had long kept a school at Chichester in Sussex, a man of parts, David James Dove. Hearing of the Academy just being formed he offered himself as head of the English School. He was appointed, at first on trial, then permanently, though with a salary of only £150 a year, whereas the head of the Latin School received £200, a discrimination which was characteristic and of which Franklin long afterward complained. Dove was a great success. He had a certain knack of teaching, reading a well-selected piece of good English literature with the greatest care as to pronunciation and emphasis, then requiring each pupil in turn to imitate his manner of reading. Parents of the boys came to hear their children perform, and he soon had ninety pupils in the school and was granted two assistants.

Poorly paid and of restless activity, he opened, in addition to his work at the Academy, a girls' school, at first apparently in one of the rooms in the New Building, afterwards in his own house. It soon appeared that he was leaving the Academy in the morning at eleven and in the afternoon at four. The Trustees insisted that he give the Academy its full hours. Each side was firm, so in 1753 he resigned and opened a private school for boys

and girls in Vidal's Alley, a popular location for private schools. The Trustees never again found so good a teacher. Later he taught in the newly opened Germantown Academy, but had somewhat similar differences with its trustees, so again resigned and built and opened in the neighborhood a school of his own where he took boarding as well as day scholars. He had—unusual for a schoolmaster—a flair for making good investments, and as a speculation bought ground and built two small houses on Fourth Street south of the Academy. Years afterward the Trustees felt themselves, as already told, obliged to buy these houses at the high price he demanded. He also took an active part in the political conflicts of the day, as will later appear.

Dove's successor was Franklin's neighbor and friend Ebenezer Kinnersley, a local schoolmaster, a Baptist clergyman, "a large, venerable looking man," as one of his pupils describes him, a native of Gloucester, England, who had come as a child with his father to Pennsylvania. He was self-educated, or at least home-educated, but intelligent and well read. He became interested, like so many ingenious men of the time, in electricity, lectured on its phenomena in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Newport, and is much better known as a colleague and correspondent, perhaps a rival, of Franklin in this field than as a teacher of the English language. Though his title was Professor of English it was on the ground of his scientific acquirements that he was given the honorary degree of M.A. by the College in 1757 and was elected to the American Philosophical Society in 1758. His suggestion that houses might be protected from lightning by iron rods and Franklin's experiment with the kite were only three months apart, in March and June respectively of the year 1752.

There is no evidence of any jealous feeling between them. Franklin's eminence in other respects and his many opportunities for publication gave disproportionate prominence to his discoveries, and the cudgels have been taken up for Kinnersley by various champions of the priority of his observations. But he himself wrote a letter to the newspapers protesting against the charges of unfairness brought against Franklin. Kinnersley made a valuable collection of electrical instruments, "perhaps

equal to any apparatus of the kind in the world," according to David Rittenhouse, a good judge, which it will be remembered the College bought from his widow. Whether because of his ill health or other interests, or lack of energy, or, as Franklin believed, of the systematic neglect of the English School by the Trustees and the diversion of his work from that school to the teaching of English in the Latin School and the College, the English School certainly did not flourish under his direction. It dragged along with but few students and little recognition. The early interest of the community in its public exercises and demonstrations of the "elegances of the English language," followed by the complaints of parents that these were suspended and that their sons were not being taught what had been promised made the condition of the school a frequent subject of discussion and half-hearted attempts at reform. In 1769 it was seriously proposed by the Trustees to discontinue it, but on examination of their charters and constitution they found they were unable to do so.

Professor Kinnersley's health became more and more insecure, and although two assistants were provided for him in 1768, at £25 each per annum "to be paid out of a fund to be raised by some public performance for the benefit of the College," yet in 1773 his resignation was accepted and his death followed five years later. His widow was allowed to occupy their rooms in the dormitory rent-free for six months.

Arrangements were made for James Wilson, the future jurist, already, as has been noted, a tutor in the Latin School, to take temporary charge of the English School at an additional salary of £60. In 1779 the Trustees loaned the English School for a few weeks to the managers of the state lottery of that year, the English scholars being taught in the Latin School till their numbers proved to be so great that there was no room for the intruders and the managers of the lottery had to be asked to vacate. Later in that year John Heffernan was engaged to take charge of the English, Mathematical, and Writing schools. But the end of the English School, as of the rest of the College and Academy in their colonial form, was then approaching and no arrangements were permanent.

The Mathematical School owed its prominence to the large part that subject played in the curriculum of the College, to the general interest of the time in mathematics, pure and applied, and in allied subjects, and to the excellence of its masters. The first in the series was Theophilus Grew, a well-known city schoolmaster, who had attracted attention by publishing a description of the approaching eclipse of the sun. He was elected Mathematical Professor in 1750 and remained master of the school, giving instruction also in the College, for nine years. He wrote a textbook on the *Use of the Globe* for the use of students in the Academy and College. He was known in the city and took an active part in its scientific interests. Students were in early times separately enrolled in this as in the Latin and English schools; in 1757 there were twenty-two and in 1760 there were twenty, but later it was joined sometimes with the English, sometimes with the Writing School without a group of students of its own. Hugh Williamson of the first graduating class spent three years of his varied and distinguished career as teacher, clergyman, physician, astronomer, scientist, and participant in most of the events of the Revolution, acting as master of the Mathematical School. In fact the elementary and pure mathematics taught in this school merged so readily into the "natural philosophy" beloved of Dr. Smith, into the electricity of Kinnersley and the applied mathematics of such a genius as Rittenhouse or Godfrey and later of Patterson that there was a general flavor of mathematics about the institution quite apart from the formal requirements, though even these were accentuated in the college curriculum.¹

The Writing School was subsidiary, though the Trustees paid much attention to good chirography. No scholars were separately entered in this school; it was little more than the room to which students from other schools went to be trained in penmanship. There were occasionally an independent writing master and tutors, though for most of the time the school was in charge of a professor and tutors properly belonging to other schools. One of the tutors in the English School, as has been remarked, was

¹ Florian Cajori, *The Teaching and History of Mathematics in the United States*, pp. 36-42.

detailed to use his early morning and after-school hours in making quill pens for use in the Writing School.

We turn at last to the teaching in the College. The activity of Dr. Smith must be recalled to mind. His restlessness, vigor, distinctive personality, and ideas have already come repeatedly into this story and will continue to do so as long as it deals with the colonial College. The Provost and the College were indistinguishable. His colleague, Vice-Provost Alison, was, although less conspicuous, scarcely less influential in the internal affairs of the institution. His career was not dissimilar to that of the Provost. Like him he was a Scotchman, or at least an Ulster Scotch-Irishman; he was educated first in Donegal, later at the University of Glasgow. He came to America as a young man of thirty as tutor in the family of a man of position in Maryland, was ordained a Presbyterian minister and became preacher and schoolmaster at New London, Pennsylvania. His school, partly supported by the Presbyterian Church, became famous for the later prominence of its pupils. They included three signers of the Declaration of Independence, besides Charles Thomson, whose career has already been described, Dr. Ewing of Princeton and Philadelphia, James Latta and Hugh Williamson, both later prominent in the history of the University, the state, and the nation.

Alison was one of those local schoolmasters from whom the earliest Faculty of the Academy was recruited, and when its full-fledged College charter was given he was named Vice-Provost and Professor of the Higher Classics, Logic, Metaphysics and Geography. When the multifarious possibilities under this title did not occupy him sufficiently he was authorized by the Trustees to lecture on "any other of the Arts and Sciences that he may judge himself qualified to teach." When Dr. Smith taught the subjects enumerated above, Dr. Alison might use the surplus of his time to teach Latin and Greek in the Grammar School. He was, incidentally, assistant minister of the influential First Presbyterian Church. He was a good scholar and was given the honorary degree of M.A. by Yale in 1755 and Princeton in 1756, and D.D. by Glasgow, his own university, in 1758. He took as much part in Presbyterian as Dr. Smith did in Episcopal affairs, and visited

more than once both New and Old England. He spent twenty-seven years in the service of the College and died in 1779. He is said to have had an easily aroused but readily placated temper, and he left a kindly impression on a whole generation of students.

It was not to be supposed that Provost Smith, brimful of ideas of what a college education ought to be, now provided with material on which to work and aided by an enlightened and sympathetic colleague, would neglect this opportunity to organize an ideal college course. He had already, while a young man in Scotland, been occupied in devising plans for the better education and more liberal payment of parish schoolmasters. The year 1753, when he was in England and Scotland for ordination, was the year of the introduction of the "New Regulations" of King's College in the University of Aberdeen, his old university, and he may readily have seen a transcript of these when there; a manuscript copy is now in the University of Pennsylvania Library. He had scarcely landed in the New World when he wrote and published in a New York newspaper an essay on education, and the next year, 1753, he drew up and published "at the desire of some gentlemen of New York who were appointed to receive proposals relative to the establishment of a college in that province" his *Idea of the College of Mirania* already adverted to. When this had been exchanged with Franklin for his *Idea of an English School and Proposals*, his election to the Academy and College in Philadelphia soon followed.

It was a day of college planning. The advertisement in the New York *Gazette*, May 1754, of the opening of the New York College, according to what Dr. Smith calls "Dr. Johnson's odd plan" showed, it is true, little effect of the suggestions made the year before by the author of the *College of Mirania*, and was somewhat vague. It was nevertheless a formal declaration of what things a college should teach. President Burr of Princeton was to issue a more general statement of educational policy in 1764, only a decade later. *The Scheme of a Liberal Education* of Dr. Smith of 1754 was the most notable of these plans. Although it is attributed to the Faculty and was, no doubt, approved by his colleagues, it echoes the voice of the Provost. Indeed, in addition to being spread in full on the Trustees' minutes and

published at their request in the *Philadelphia Gazette*, three months later, and in the *American Magazine* in 1758, it was published by Dr. Smith in England in the volume of his *Discourses*.

The English School and the other more practical schools are not mentioned in the *Scheme*, not being considered parts of a liberal education, but a curriculum for the Latin School, preparatory to the College, was an essential part of the plan. This preparatory course was intended for boys from nine or ten to fourteen or fifteen. It consists entirely of Latin and a little Greek, except for some geography and chronology in the third year, arithmetic begun late in the last year, training in penmanship and "Writing and Reading of English to be continued if necessary"; "continued" presumably beyond what they had learned in a still more elementary school, or at home. This preparatory course might take three, four, or five years.

It is the content and the organization of the College course proper, however, that gives this plan its significance. It was the earliest systematic arrangement, in America, of a group of college studies not following medieval tradition and not having a specifically religious object. It corresponds in originality, though far removed in ideal, to Franklin's stillborn conception of a purely English college education. Although professedly introduced as an experiment to be tried for three years, it remained the curriculum of the College through the whole colonial period, and indeed until far into the nineteenth century. It was a three-year course, the students being ranked successively as freshmen, juniors, and seniors: a sophomore year was insinuated into the course only long afterward. There were three terms in each college year.

Latin and Greek, of course, continued through the whole course, all afternoons being devoted to the reading of classic authors; some twenty being named, with variations allowed for. They ranged from Horace and Juvenal to Longinus and Grotius' *De Jure Belli et Pacis*. As the last-named work suggests, there was an attempt to arrange the authors not only in the order of the difficulty of their language but of the maturity required to understand them and the applicability of the matter with which they

dealt to the general course. As Dr. Smith says in his explanation, the students

. . . shall never drop their acquaintance with the classic sages. They are every day called to converse with some one of the ancients who at the same time that he charms with all the beauties of his language is generally illustrating that particular branch of philosophy or science to which the other hours of the day are devoted.

However impracticable such an ideal may be, as every experienced teacher knows, the effort to make the course a unit is none the less evident and laudable. With this object in view the first half of the college course is devoted to what the author of the scheme calls "Instrumental Philosophy," suited to strengthening the mental faculties which will be used in the latter part of the course. The student is "to be led through a scale of easy ascent till finally rendered capable of Thinking, Writing and Acting well, which is the grand aim of a liberal education"—an absolutely impeccable aspiration.

Mathematics and natural science are notably prominent in the course, occupying all the later morning hours, and the earlier morning hours of at least one teacher. Just as one-third of the college course was devoted to the classics, so another third was devoted to mathematics and science. The former included geometry, trigonometry, and conic sections, the latter physics, astronomy, chemistry, botany, and zoölogy. The remaining third of the student's time was devoted to logic, ethics, metaphysics, and training in oratory. As opportunity offered, provision was made for declamation, disputation, and oration, forms of training approved alike by Franklin and Smith. Of course the study of the large subjects named in the *Scheme* must have touched only their high points. "Surveying and dialling, navigation, conic sections and fluxions," to be treated in thirty lectures, and astronomy, the natural history of vegetables and animals, and "chemistry, fossils and agriculture" all given in one hour daily in senior year, can have been little more than a series of definitions.

We have indeed Dr. Smith's own testimony to the amount of time that should be given to these several subjects. Mr. Martin,

who had brought him to America as tutor to his two sons, now pupils in the College, was in 1754 planning to transfer the boys to King's College about to be opened in New York, so that they might be nearer home. In July Dr. Smith wrote in protest. He says they have already begun moral philosophy and would finish it in October; from October to February or March they would read critically some ancient writers on rhetoric, with English imitations of the works of the great Greek and Roman orators. In the spring, for five or six weeks they would be shown experiments in natural philosophy, that is to say in physics, and the summer they would spend on the "Elements of civil Law, the reading of History and the study of the Ends and Uses of Society, the different Forms of Government, etc. etc." During all this time they would regularly spend two hours every day with mathematics, and they would also read Greek and Latin "during proper hours." Thus all that these college students were to have in the way of instruction in advanced mathematics, physics, history, politics, economics, and public law, with a running accompaniment of steady reading of the classics and exercises in the preparation of set orations, would fall within the space of fifteen months.

The Faculty were careful to point out that this curriculum was subject to modification according to "Sentiments of men of learning," and that its principal value would be as a foundation for study and reading, subsequent to graduation, for which presumably it would have given the students a liking. To encourage such "manly perseverance in private study" the proposed curriculum was accompanied by an extensive list of the most serious authors in each field. The list, however unlikely to be followed by the generality of college graduates, is no mean testimony to eighteenth-century knowledge and its accessibility in a distant provincial capital. A considerable number of the books listed were already in the College library, and some of the very copies they used are still standing on the shelves among the host of subsequent acquisitions.

The authors of the curriculum acknowledge their doubt concerning its completion in so short a period as three years, but believe it can be mastered in that time by "a middling genius,

with ordinary application"; and state the conviction, so constantly reached anew by their successors, that where both application and genius are wanting, "no time will be found sufficient" for a college education. Local conditions had also to be recognized. In the provinces, according to Dr. Smith, genius seems to be sooner ripe, also "a more easy settlement and opportunities for genteel employment are more available for young men of parts than in European countries. They will therefore be more impatient to complete their courses, and unwilling to spend more than three years in college study. In this curriculum the College was evidently striving to free itself from mere tradition. True to the circumstances of the origin of the College, it was quite free from sectarianism and indeed from any form of theological limitation. It paid more than usual respect to mathematics and gave its students at least a glimpse of contemporary physical and natural science, and even of those subjects which have been later grouped as the social sciences.

Notwithstanding this modern character, the curriculum of this, like other contemporary colleges, showed more than a trace of that scholasticism which has been through the centuries the subject of so much praise and so much blame, and is due now in some directions for a revival. Among the eighteenth-century archives of this and the other colonial colleges are to be found a somewhat puzzling series of printed sheets. They are usually "broadsides," of twenty by twenty-five inches, evidently intended to be handed around among the audience at Commencement along with the regular Commencement programs. They are worded much alike, whether printed and used at Philadelphia, Yale, Harvard, Brown, or Princeton, each of these institutions having a more or less extended series. Those of Pennsylvania are for the years 1761, 1762, and 1763. Brown has thirty, Princeton four. They are in Latin, dedicated in the names of the members of the graduating class to the civil authorities, at Philadelphia in 1763, to Thomas and Richard Penn, Governor Hamilton, and the Trustees, Provost, Vice-Provost, and professors, all by name and with many expressions of respect. The main body of each paper is a series of propositions, statements, or theses, classified under various academic heads—metaphysics, ethics, mathema-

tics, grammar, and others—which presumably the graduating students were willing to defend against any assertions to the contrary. The similarity among these documents points toward a common origin, and this is obviously to be found in the practice of medieval universities. The *trivium* and *quadrivium* are clearly reflected in the classification under seven main heads of the ninety statements that the nine prospective graduates at Pennsylvania at the Commencement of 1763 announced themselves as ready to defend. The same is true of the sixty-three theses arranged under nine groups which the nine graduates of Princeton of the class of 1751 announce themselves as ready to prove. As to subject they range all the way from "All the perfections of God are essentials of his nature" to "The rights of the people are as divine as those of their rulers," which last was surely a good proposition to defend in preparation for the Declaration of Independence which was to come so few years later. On the whole, however, the theses were statements that had been discussed a thousand times before, and some of them for a thousand years and more.

It is obvious that these Latin discussions or proposed discussions are to be grouped with the degrees, the hoods, the processions, and the use of Latin itself as among the practices that even yet mark colleges and universities as the most conservative institutions in modern society, so far at least as concerns outward forms. How far were these offers to debate in Latin, against opponents using the same language, made by the boys of fourteen to eighteen who were getting their A.B. degrees, genuinely representative of their abilities, their interests and their training; how far were they only a "solemn farce," as a later Provost, in a moment of vexation, called the public examination of the students which was required by the statutes? The answer must depend on the critical habits of mind of the reader. It is to be remembered, however, that the students had given more than one-third of their school and college time to the reading of Latin and Greek authors, that they had heard frequent lectures on the classics and on classical subjects by the Provost and Vice-Provost during their last two years. As to discussion, stress was constantly laid upon the practice of disputation. The Commencement pro-

grams frequently announce "forensic disputations" in Latin between two or more of the graduating class. "Scholasticism" may have occupied an appreciably large part of the student's course.

On the other hand it is quite possible that such Latin speech as was used at Commencement may have been, as the Greek and Latin salutatories were long afterward, carefully written out beforehand, corrected and reconstructed under the eye of the professors, and committed to memory by the students concerned. The preparation of English Commencement addresses by some one other than the one who delivered them was, as we know, only too familiar.¹

Such, with all their internal and external limitations, were the educational ideals and plan of the College. How far they achieved their object there is no way of testing. There is none in our own time. Education is largely a matter of faith. Many excellent men, however, graduated from the colonial College, and we can only believe that the curriculum followed was conducive to the clear thinking, informed judgment, and convincing speech that were unusually widespread in later colonial and early national Philadelphia.

COLLEGE LIFE

A considerable part of college life presumably consisted in studying textbooks, listening to lectures, and reading. Another part consisted in the individual and group social life of the students, with the traditional merrymaking, mischief, and, for some of the older among them, dissipation. But there was another side of college life especially characteristic of provincial Philadelphia. This was the frequent appearance of the students before the general public. Provost Smith had no mean powers as a showman, and from the very beginning of his administration he took every occasion possible to exhibit to the admiring citizens of Philadelphia and visitors to the city the abilities of his students in oratory, debating, plays, and other means of entertaining an audience.

When the Academy was advanced to the status of a college

¹ This subject has been studied and more favorable conclusions reached by James J. Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers*, N.Y., 1933.

the great hall which formerly provided only for the seating of graduates, Faculty, Trustees, and guests of honor was altered to accommodate considerable gatherings of the general public. From that time forward there was seldom a period of many weeks or months without some function. Audiences were always available, and they were often of distinguished composition. Social opportunities in colonial times were none too numerous; so these academic occasions were gatherings of the wealth, distinction, and even fashion of the city. They were "a crowded audience," "a learned, polite and very brilliant Assembly," "Every part of the public Hall was crowded with Spectators," "a vast concourse of people of all Ranks." Such are contemporary newspaper reports. There is mention of the attendance of notable persons. "The Honorable the Governor, several officers of the Army, a great many Gentlemen of this and the other Colonies and a number of Ladies and Citizens were pleased to favor us with their Presence," is said of a later Commencement. At one time Lord Loudon, Commander of all the British forces in America, is present; at another the Governor and an ex-Governor of Pennsylvania, and the Governor of Providence, attend with, as usual, "a large audience of ladies and gentlemen." In 1767 the music is furnished by the band of the Royal Irish Regiment then quartered in Philadelphia.

Even the public examinations, which seniors were then required to undergo before they could take their degrees, and to which all citizens must by college statute be invited, had their interested and attentive audience. Sometimes the college function was a formal reception to a new governor or to a famous visitor to the city. In 1759 as a part of a celebration at the College of the arrival in the province of Governor James Hamilton he was addressed by an Academy boy with the same family name as his own, "Billy" Hamilton, in an invocation beginning

O Friend to Science, Liberty and Truth,
Patron of Virtue, Arts and rising Youth.

This boy was the William Hamilton who became owner of "Woodlands," adjacent to the present University campus, and although later exiled as a Tory, he still looks out from a canvas

painted by Benjamin West of the class of 1757 on meetings of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania not so very different in character from that at which he officiated in person in 1759.

Professors and students alike dropped readily into verse in those days; Provost Smith was always ready with a metrical production, Professor Beveridge published poems in Latin, Dove dealt in satirical verse, and pupils of both the Academy and the College had from the beginning expressed themselves in poetic form. It was a characteristic of the age. There was a steady flow of verse in the periodicals of the time, much of it more or less easy and graceful, though hardly poetic, much completely vapid, some mere doggerel.

For the most part it was at the formal annual Commencements that the College Faculty and students appeared before the public. There was a public ceremony for the granting of degrees in every year except one, from 1757 until the gathering American troops of 1775 and 1776, the British army of occupation of 1777 and 1778, and finally the hostile state legislature of 1779, brought the series temporarily to an end.

Some of the Commencements were of special interest. At the Commencement of 1765, Whitefield appeared in the building originally erected for his use, speaking to the students of the College as he had spoken to his congregation there twenty-five years before. He came now at the invitation of Provost Smith, who read the prayers at the service, and of the Trustees, who subsequently thanked him for his address and for thus "countenancing the institution." He saw the A.B. degree conferred on William White, the future first bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and on John Andrews, future Provost of the University. He must also have listened to the address of Dr. John Morgan, who had just been appointed to the first professorship of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in America, and laid down in this address the firm foundation of medical study at Pennsylvania and in America generally. The Commencement of 1766 was perhaps more typical than that of 1765. According to the *Gazette* "it was rendered very splendid by the Great Number of Persons present." It was opened by a salutatory oration in Latin, a practice that has been abandoned only within the last

half-century; then came an English oration, then a Latin "Syllogistic Disputation *'utrum praescientia deorum tollit Libertatem agendi'*," followed by another oration in English. The afternoon session opened with another debate, this time in English; four of the graduating class threshing out, rather late in their academic career, the question, "Whether Ease be the Chief Good." There followed the valedictory, and another dialogue, "In Honor of the Friends of America," after which "the two Master Banksons," boys in the Latin School, sang odes on "Liberty" and "Patriotism" written by Thomas Hopkinson, one of the graduating class. The accompaniment on the organ seems to have been played by Francis Hopkinson, older brother of the author of the odes. One of the odes contained a pleasant compliment to Colonel Barré, who had recently visited the College and was now in high favor in America because of his opposition to the Stamp Act. The political tinge of this Commencement was doubtless due to the excitement concerning that act which had stirred Philadelphia to its political depths, and news of the repeal of which had reached the city only the day before Commencement.

The graduates of this year, of whom there were twelve, obtained rather less distinction than most classes. Four became Episcopal clergymen and three Presbyterian ministers, one of them a future President of Delaware College. Three became lawyers and one a physician. When the great time of decision came, a disproportionate number took the Royalist side: three retired to England, though one of these came back to Philadelphia after the Revolution as British Consul General. Two recipients of honorary degrees were of special interest. In addition to the Master's Degree regularly conferred according to the English practice three years after the A.B., the custom of giving the M.A., as an honorary degree was becoming an almost invariable part of the Commencement exercises. The College had some years before begun to confer the M.A. upon "Ministers and Gentlemen of this and the neighboring Colonies who were of distinguished character for their Usefulness and Learning." They had in 1760 granted the degree to the President of Princeton and to six Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland clergy-

men. The Faculty, who usually selected the recipients of degrees on their own initiative, recommended them so liberally that in 1762 the Trustees passed a resolution restricting the practice on the ground that "the College must lose Reputation by Confering too many Honorary Degrees."

James Wilson and Joseph Reed, who received the honorary degree of A.M. in 1766, would, however, have reflected honor on any institution. Wilson, who had been a student successively in the Scotch universities, St. Andrews, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, though he had not taken a degree in one of them, was now a tutor in the College. Between this year when he was given the M.A., and 1790 when he was given the degree of LL.D., there were few forms of public service and distinction he had not passed through; member of the Provincial Council and the Constitutional Convention of Pennsylvania and of the Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a member of the Constitutional Convention, appointed by Washington Justice of the Supreme Court, through his whole career he remained interested in the College, as tutor, as Master of the English School, as Trustee, as Professor of Law. In this last capacity we shall meet with him again in this narrative. Reed, the other recipient of the honorary degree this year, was scarcely less eminent and scarcely less closely connected with the College, though in strangely contrasted relationships, which will likewise appear later. He was an A.B. of Princeton and had been a student at the Middle Temple in London; he was later a member of the Continental Congress, Adjutant General of the American Army, Aide-de-Camp to Washington, and President of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania.

In a small city with a still smaller social class, at College Commencements the Provost was glad to draw in outside participants, especially when, as so generally occurred, there were musical events for which as chorus the young men and young women of the city were needed. At the Commencements of 1760 and 1761, for instance, odes successively of mourning for the death of George II and congratulation over the accession of George III were set to music by Francis Hopkinson, and sung by "a sett of Ladies and Gentlemen" who "kindly employed their agreeable

talents to do Honour to the occasion." Hopkinson both as student and alumnus was frequently the author of the words as well as the composer of the music for these productions, and indeed frequently accompanied them and gave other performances on the organ. This gifted young man, member of the first graduating class, who received his A.B. in 1757 and his M.A. at Philadelphia in 1760 and at Princeton in 1763, son of a Trustee, himself later a Trustee and ancestor of honored Trustees through four generations, gave to the early Commencements of the College a musical significance unique among American colonial colleges.

The most ambitious literary and musical undertaking of the College students during this period was, however, not given in connection with Commencement but in the Christmas holidays.¹ This was a performance of a play, *The Masque of Alfred the Great*, given in Christmas week of 1756 and subsequent weeks. The play had been written in England sixteen years before and played by Garrick at Covent Garden. A number of changes and additions were made by the Provost, as it was thought best to leave out all women's parts, though some young ladies volunteered to sing the songs; the Epilogue was spoken by Jacob Duché, then a senior, and other parts by other students; Hopkinson composed a song, "sung by two nimble spirits."

The students were even counted on by the Trustees in the winter of 1768 to give a performance for the benefit of the College, to make possible the engagement of two additional tutors. In 1759 the Prologue and Epilogue of *Tamerlane*, played by the regular theatrical company in Philadelphia, were written by Hopkinson, and in return their last performance of the season was a benefit for the purchase of an organ for College Hall and to pay for the expense of teaching the children of the Charity School to sing hymns and church music, "in order to render the Entertainment of the Town more complete at Commencements and other public occasions in our College."

The tradition of play-writing and play-acting continued among students and graduates of the College. In 1767 a "Son of Philadelphia College" is declared by a Princeton man to be

¹ See *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, Jan. 20, 27, Feb. 3, 10, 1757, and A. H. Quinn, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20, with corrections in *Alumni Register*, April 1926.

the author of *The Disappointment*, a somewhat scurrilous play, the acting of which at the theatre in the city was forbidden. The critic on hearing it read "thinks Princeton poets as good as their neighbors." Thomas Godfrey, author of *The Prince of Parthia*, the first play to be written and acted in America, was one of that little coterie of three friends, Francis Hopkinson, Benjamin West, and Thomas Godfrey, who were all aided in their artistic careers by Provost Smith, the first two as students in the College, the last by personal influence.

Apart from their appearance at Commencement exercises and occasional dramatic shows, and required attendance in the classroom, the picture of the life of the students in the colonial college is a shadowy one. Occasionally one emerges as an individual, thanks to some casual record. In October 1775 young William Temple Franklin, son of William Franklin and grandson of Benjamin, entered college. Promptly he writes to his father: "Dear Sir, I have the pleasure to inform you that I entered the College the 14th of this month without any difficulty, and according to your desire in your letter of October 9th I shall inform you of the studies I am engaged in." He proceeds with a circumstantial if somewhat recklessly spelled account of his studies, the hours of preparation and recitation, the assembly and calling of the roll at eight o'clock every morning, "and whoever is absent has a cross put to his name for which he pays a fine of two coppers," though the younger boys are "allowed the privilege of choosing wether they will pay the fine or be ferruled." There is much turning of Latin into English and English into Latin—they are reading and construing Livy—some writing of English themes and turning them into Latin; three times a week they are taught geography, and Dr. Smith instructs them in mathematics. He sees little time ahead for fencing or dancing, which his father seems to have prescribed, but thinks he could go to dancing school Saturday afternoons if Dr. Ellison,¹ Professor of Greek and Latin would excuse him from his Saturday's Latin, "as I don't think I shall be able to dance with so much spirit when the thought of making a Latin Theme before I go to Bed is sticking in my stom-

¹ Francis Alison.

ach." He closes by the frank admission that "I am greatly at a loss for want of Livy's Roman History in English, that I might look over the Lesson the night before I am to say it as the rest of the class do." His grandfather, curiously enough, has no copy, he has inquired at every bookseller's shop in Philadelphia, and it is not to be had. He would be greatly obliged, if his father does not have it, if he would write to New York for it, "That I may get it if it is to be got." Young Franklin's college career was a short one. The next year his grandfather went to Europe; he went with him as companion and secretary, and never returned to this country.¹

There is little to be learned from contemporary records concerning the physical activities and lighter amusements of the students. The recommendation of Franklin in the *Proposals* that a site should be chosen for the Academy and College that would permit running, swimming, wrestling, etc., was abandoned when the New Building with its city location and restricted playing grounds was bought. Athletics in the modern sense were unknown. Such information as we get is about the Academy pupils rather than the older students in the College. Alexander Graydon, for instance, who has left a vivacious account of student recreations, attended the Academy between 1762 and 1766, from the time he was ten until he had just turned fourteen, but did not enter the College. He tells of the spirited races around the block bounded by Arch, Fifth, Market, and Fourth streets, a distance of nearly half a mile. One of his friends, a boy from Virginia who boarded at his mother's house on Arch Street, achieved such reputation as a runner that competitors were sought from Penn Charter and other schools, but none could beat him.

Graydon has much to say about swimming, rowing, sailing, and skating on the Delaware. Although among the boys running "was all the rage" as he says, skating was the popular sport for their elders. There was a local style of skating superior, according to the chronicler, to that of either New England, Hol-

¹ Franklin Papers in Library of American Philosophical Society, vol. 48, no. 145; J. Bennett Nolan, "The Only Franklin in Franklin's College," *General Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, Oct. 1939, pp. 3-17.

land, or Great Britain. Winters seem to have been colder in the eighteenth century than in more recent times. The long, cold winters of which we hear, when the College cordwood was hauled by horses and oxen across the Delaware on the ice, have no modern equivalent.

Much mere mischief was chargeable to the younger boys. Not only were there frequent complaints that students did not show proper respect to the professors, but anecdotes have been preserved showing the survival of familiar childish tricks, such as the twitching off of Professor Beveridge's wig, and the closing of the shutters from the outside so that in the dark the professor might be made the target for textbooks and blackboard erasers. The constant expense of broken windows is suggestive. There were the familiar complaints that students were absent from classes, and charges, more characteristic of the time, that they did not attend any public worship on Sundays.

Unfortunately the few glimpses we get of the behavior of the older students are still more unfavorable. In one of the very earliest years of the College there was a disciplinary quarrel between Dr. Smith and one of the sons of William Allen, a Trustee. In 1769 there was complaint of special lack of discipline and it was decided that three, on account of their bad behavior and evil example, should no longer be continued in the College, although one of the three had been entered by Dr. Alison and another was under the guardianship of Mr. Hopkinson, Trustee. In 1770 a student was called before the Board on the charge that he had stayed out from his lodging till one o'clock in the morning and then broken open the window shutters of one of the tutors because he would not admit the roysterer "at that unseasonable hour"; he was expelled. When Dr. Morgan went to Jamaica in 1772 he was commissioned to advise a certain planter there to withdraw his son from the College, as he was wasting £200 a year, or more.

But these instances of dissipation and bad behavior must not be taken too seriously. In the records of college discipline

The evil that men do lives after them,
The good is oft interred with their bones.

There is little occasion for recording good behavior or describing a faultless character. There are some instances even of the latter. The two young Martins to whom Dr. Smith in his youth had been tutor both died early, William in 1754 in Philadelphia during his college course, Josiah in 1762 in the island of Antigua, his father's home. Provost Smith preached an eloquent sermon at Christ Church on the death and character of the former. This was published soon afterward, accompanied by a group of verses by four of Martin's classmates and a tutor, all laudatory of his character and appreciative of Dr. Smith's praise of him. He is spoken of as

. . . late the fairest plant in virtue's plain
The brightest youth in wisdom's rising train.

More natural characteristics are perhaps commemorated in some further lines:

For we remember well his matchless power
To steal upon the heart and cheer the social hour.

Francis Hopkinson long afterward wrote an elegy on the death of his former classmate, the second of the two brothers.

FOUNDATION OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL

The addition of the medical courses to the Philosophical School was not only important in itself but justified calling the College afterwards a university. It was in 1765 that the actual introduction of the medical courses took place; in 1771, six years afterward, the Provost declared that the institution was now "entitled not merely to the name of a College but of an University"; in 1772 Dr. John Morgan, traveling in Jamaica, speaks of it as "the University of Philadelphia." On its reorganization in 1779 the term was formally adopted.

Dr. John Morgan, the original proponent of the introduction of medical courses into the College, and the first medical professor, was a colorful character. His early life exemplified many of the conditions we have adverted to as characteristic of co-

lonial Philadelphia and its College. His grandfather, a Welsh merchant, was one of those immigrants who obtained wealth through commerce in Philadelphia. His father was one of the original contributors to the Academy, a friend and near neighbor of Franklin. Young Morgan received a good classical education in one of those schools kept by a Presbyterian minister in the vicinity of Philadelphia that furnished much the best education available before the establishment of the Academy. His preceptor was Dr. Finley, afterward President of Princeton. Morgan entered the College of Philadelphia at its opening and graduated with its first class, in 1757, when he was in his twenty-second year. Few men have entered on their life work with better training. Even while he was doing his college work he was apprenticed to Dr. Redman, a prominent Philadelphia physician who had received his M.D. degree at Leyden in 1748. While under this instruction he served for a year as apothecary in the newly established Pennsylvania Hospital in compounding medicine for the six physicians who served there. He completed the terms of his apprenticeship with Dr. Redman just in time to obtain a military medical commission and to gain some surgical experience with the provincial troops in the campaign of 1759.

In 1760, when twenty-five years old, like other ambitious and well-to-do young Philadelphians preparing for a profession, he went to England, where he had the valuable patronage of Franklin, then living in London as agent for Pennsylvania and other colonies. A year of medical study and observation in London hospitals under such famous physicians as John Fothergill, John and William Hunter, and William Hewson was an opportunity such as could not possibly have been obtained in the colonies. But Edinburgh was then probably the most famous place for medical education in Europe, certainly for English-speaking students. Some twenty years earlier a group of Scotch physicians, several of them graduates of Leyden, had introduced medical courses in the University at Edinburgh, and its recognition as a center of medical training had been rising ever since. In 1761 Morgan entered there, carrying a warm letter of introduction from Franklin to Lord Kames, Chancellor of the Uni-

versity, which guaranteed him the interest of the medical professors. It was in Edinburgh that the foundation was laid for what proved to be the beginning of medical teaching at Philadelphia. Morgan met there an old fellow student at Dr. Finley's Academy, William Shippen, Jr., son of a Trustee of the Philadelphia College but himself a graduate, probably because of his Presbyterian connection, of Princeton. The two discussed a plan of giving courses of medical lectures in Philadelphia after their return, but there is no indication that they proposed at this time to connect these with the College. A difference of opinion on this matter was a grievance in the mind of Shippen long afterward and was not without influence on the medical history of the Revolution, when a bitter dispute occurred between the two, who were appointed successively medical heads of the American army. Shippen obtained his degree at Edinburgh in 1762, went directly back to Philadelphia and proceeded to offer a course in anatomy in an outbuilding of his father's house on Fourth Street, the first formal medical lectures given in the English colonies.

Morgan stayed on at Edinburgh for a second year, receiving his degree in 1763 and writing a Latin thesis which was printed and received considerable attention. Well-to-do young Americans, like the same class of Englishmen, were apt to make "the grand tour" when they finished their formal education. So Morgan with his friend Samuel Powell of Philadelphia, a graduate of the College class following his, a young man of wealth and influence whom the Provost had taken with him and presented to King George in 1762, set out for a journey of several months. They visited Holland, France, Switzerland, and Italy. At Paris, Morgan perfected himself in a method of injecting anatomical specimens with wax that he made effective use of afterward. They passed through the south of France, then on to Rome, Venice, Florence, Turin, Geneva, and so through France back to Paris. On the way they were presented to the Pope, the Duke of York, then living in Rome, and the King of Sardinia. They visited Voltaire at Ferney and found the philosopher in his most exuberant mood, speaking English with them, though not very readily, declaring his admiration for Franklin, about whose elec-

trical experiments he knew, trying to draw them into a dispute on religion, and expressing the greatest admiration for everything English. The whole journey seems to have been one of enlightenment. Morgan heard Torreziani lecture to a group of medical students at Parma and had a long conversation with Professor Morgagni at Padua, still writing and teaching at eighty-two years of age. He visited the famous hospital at Milan, with its ten physicians in attendance in the morning and fifteen in the afternoon, ten surgeons and some seventy young internes acting as their assistants. He may well have been struck with the difference between the medical equipment of the old world and the new. In the meantime he had been elected Fellow of the Colleges of Physicians of Edinburgh and London and of the French Royal Society of Surgery, and was soon afterward made Fellow of the Royal Society. If he wanted other honors he must create them for himself in new surroundings.

Returning to London after his three years' absence, he was forced by the lateness of the season to spend a few impatient months before returning to his own country. He had by this time developed a well-defined scheme for introducing formal medical education into America, somewhat along the lines he had seen in existence in Europe, and connecting it with his own College in Philadelphia, just as medical instruction had been introduced from Leyden into the University of Edinburgh twenty years before. To discussion and preparation for this project he seems to have given his remaining time in London. He wrote most of the address he proposed to deliver as soon as he had opportunity in explanation of his plan, and secured the approval and written recommendation of Thomas Penn, Franklin, Mr. Peters who was then in London, Dr. Fothergill, and Dr. Cullen, one of his most valued advisers at the University of Edinburgh. When he returned to Philadelphia, therefore, he was well primed with his plans.

His native city was no less ready, furnished with a group of excellent physicians, possessing a hospital in which six of these physicians gave free service, an almshouse which was also a hospital, and public lectures on anatomy already initiated by a colleague. The College was sure to be responsive to his proposals;

little would be needed beyond the formality of presentation and acceptance of his project. This was accomplished at a special meeting of the Board of Trustees May 3, 1765. Penn had written directly to the Trustees in advocacy of the plan, and Morgan himself presented a letter of recommendation for himself and for the project from the two Trustees of the College then in London. The result was the unanimous election of Morgan as "Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physick." Two weeks later the Commencement of the year 1765 was made to gather largely around this addition to the work of the College. On two successive hot days, the thirtieth and thirty-first of May, the two sections of Dr. Morgan's "Discourse Upon the Institution of Medical Schools in America" were read in their fullness as part of the group of literary productions of the occasion. The "Discourse" was subsequently printed and has, because of its logical structure, its judicious definitions, and its wise suggestions and warnings, become a classic.¹

It is to be noted that Morgan used the word "schools" in the plural. His own course on theory and practice would be one, others should follow. This extension occurred promptly. William Shippen had already in the years 1762-65 given privately three successive courses in anatomy. These courses attracted much attention, the opening lecture being given in the State House. They received general approval, except from the mob, suspicious of his practice of dissection. His dissecting room was at one time invaded and he himself roughly handled. He found it necessary after his second course of lectures to publish in the newspapers a denial of the charges by "some evil-minded persons, either wantonly or maliciously," that he had taken up bodies from the church burying ground, and gave assurance that the bodies he dissected were suicides or executed criminals or, occasionally, paupers whose death was due to some peculiar or unusual disease.

Shippen had suggested in his address at the opening of his first course of lectures, in 1762, the desirability of having all branches of medicine taught in the city, but had made no move

¹ In addition to various accounts of these events there is a brief narrative in some early hand in the earliest minute book of the Medical Faculty.

to connect them with the College, although his father was a Trustee and was himself a physician. In fact Dr. Fothergill, his English adviser, seems at first to have contemplated their organization and support by the Provincial Legislature. Now, however, in the fall succeeding Morgan's election, Shippen, not without some indication of vexation at having been neglected in Morgan's proposal, offered himself as Professor of Anatomy and Surgery, declaring that he had thought of the plan for seven years and mentioned it three years before. He was immediately elected, September 25, 1765.

The careers of the two men had been similar in many ways. They sprang alike from well-to-do mercantile families who could well afford to give them a prolonged education. The Shippen House on Second Street, the residence of Edward Shippen, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, young Shippen's uncle, was said to be the largest dwelling house in Philadelphia and was famous for its lawn and gardens. His own home on Fourth Street was scarcely less spacious, and had a more distinguished later history. It is still impressive. After their school days Shippen had gone to Princeton, of which his uncle was one of the founders just as his father had been of the College at Philadelphia, and was graduated there three years before Morgan received his A.B. from Philadelphia. Like Morgan he studied in London and then in Edinburgh. He had even gone, like Morgan, on a visit to the Continent. On being elected to the College he suspended his private anatomical lectures, and he and Morgan made a joint announcement of two courses, Morgan's on "Materia Medica," Shippen's on "Anatomy, the Parts of the Human Body and their Diseases," with dissections and the principal operations in surgery.

The list of lecturers and courses was soon extended. Dr. Adam Kuhn, the next recruit, was the son of a German physician, given a classical education at his home in Lancaster, then some training as apprentice to his father in Germantown. Like the others he went abroad for study, obtaining distinction by studying natural history with Linnæus in Sweden; later he went to Edinburgh where he received his M.D. in 1767, four years after Morgan, six years after Shippen. Returning to Philadelphia he was appointed

Professor of *Materia Medica* and Botany in the College, in February 1768. Following much the same career as his three predecessors, Benjamin Rush, a somewhat younger man, a pupil at Dr. Finley's Academy, then a graduate in Arts at Princeton in 1765, like Morgan an apprentice of Dr. Redman, and, like all three, receiving his M.D. at Edinburgh where he was graduated in 1768, was destined to have the longest and most distinguished career of any of the group. He was elected Professor of Chemistry, which was then considered as a medical subject, in August 1769, in time for the opening of the fall term of that year. This completed the original staff of medical teachers in the College. They were a remarkable group. All born in the same decade, between 1735 and 1745, the oldest scarcely more than thirty years of age, the youngest but twenty-five, all Bachelors of Arts, all trained abroad, all with the M.D. degree from Edinburgh, all men of culture, and all successful in the private practice they carried on in addition to their teaching duties.

The opportunity for observation and experience in the Pennsylvania Hospital had long been recognized as of great value, and shortly after the first medical courses in the College were opened, Dr. Thomas Bond began a course of clinical lectures in the hospital to which the medical students were admitted. Provost Smith also delivered a series of lectures on natural philosophy especially for the medical students. By 1769 what was practically a separate medical faculty had been established in the College, and in the fall of that year a joint announcement of five courses, so arranged that they could all be taken without conflict, was put in the newspapers. So the Medical School was established. Its imitation of the University of Edinburgh is evident. It is even closer than the dependence of the College proper on Aberdeen.

The plan of giving medical instruction in the College was an immediate success. A number of students enrolled, many from regions outside of Philadelphia. In the third year from the opening of medical courses rules were drawn up by those Trustees who were physicians, in consultation with the Provost and the medical professors, for the grant of appropriate degrees. The requirements were high. Considerable general equipment was de-

manded in preparation for entrance on the course: an A.B. degree must be presented or obtained as an accompaniment of the medical courses. After taking a certain number of those courses, showing a satisfactory knowledge of the Latin language, of mathematics, and of "Natural and Experimental Philosophy," serving an apprenticeship to some reputable physician, and attending the practice of the Pennsylvania Hospital for one year, a student was admitted to a private and then to a public examination. If he was successful he was given the degree of Bachelor of Physic or of Medicine. The subsequent passage of three years, the writing, printing, and publishing of a satisfactory thesis and its oral defense in public, and the attainment of twenty-four years of age entitled a Bachelor of Medicine to the degree of M.D. It goes without saying that these high standards were not permanent. They remained nevertheless the colonial practice.

In June 1768 a medical Commencement was held separate from the rest of the College, at which, with much Latin disputation, many orations by the prospective graduates, and much good advice by the Provost and Vice-Provost, medical professors and Trustees, ten young men were given the degree of Bachelor of Physic, the first medical degrees given in America. "An elegant Valedictory Oration" stating the advantages of obtaining a general liberal education before entering upon medical studies was delivered by Jonathan Potts, one of the graduates, who had studied, like his predecessors, at Edinburgh, and later became in succession to two of his preceptors Physician-in-Chief of the American troops during the Revolution.

The severe requirements for the M.D. degree and the possibility of building up a practice on a mere Bachelor's degree limited the number of those reaching the full stature of Doctors of Medicine. Medical Commencements were held in 1769, 1770, 1771, and perhaps later. But the time was rapidly approaching when the confusions of the Revolution put an end for a while to all degree giving and taking. However, four of the ten who took their first degree in 1768 conformed to the requirements and were given the degree of M.D. in June 1771, the only recipients of the full degree before the reorganization of the old College

in 1779. There were twenty-eight who took the degree of Bachelor of Physic during this period, and some ninety before the abolition of that degree in 1790.

The conception of a university as due to the addition of other courses to those of the College is Scotch, not English; it leads back in the case of the Medical School to Edinburgh and the Continent, not to Oxford or Cambridge. A university in America has come to be considered a combination of two or more faculties, not a union of several semi-independent colleges, as in England. The establishment of medical courses in a large city, in connection with hospitals and under the auspices of an educational institution, was wholesome; it gave a guarantee alike of observation of actual disease and its proper treatment and of the preservation of academic standards. In this respect also the tradition of the Medical School leads back to medical training on the Continent and to London hospitals rather than to Oxford and Cambridge, where such study was necessarily more bookish and abstract.

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE

It would be a satisfaction to record that the College of Philadelphia lived its life in the serene detachment from contemporary politics that is the happy lot of the modern University. But that was not the case. Its patronage by the Penn family, the devotion of its politically minded Provost to their interest, the inclinations of its wealthy and aristocratic Trustees all tended to bind it to one party in the government and to one class in the community. It would have been difficult for any man to devote himself at that time to the problems of education alone; for Provost Smith it was impossible.

He began teaching in Philadelphia in May 1754; by the early months of 1755 he was in the thick of Pennsylvania politics. Pennsylvania politics in the middle years of the eighteenth century are far too complicated a subject to explain here, but it may be said, in the words and according to the interpretation of Franklin, perhaps not quite a fair one, that the two principal parties represented respectively "Proprietary Interest and Power,

and Popular Liberty." He distinguished them later as "the Proprietary side" and "the friends of the people." The Provost unquestionably belonged to the former. His intimacy with the Penns, his Anglicanism, his conservative temperament, his very freedom from local entanglements made him an aggressive supporter of the "Governor's party" as against the local Assembly.

In the year 1755 he wrote two pamphlets and had them printed and distributed in England. The first was *A Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania, etc.*, the second *A Brief View of the Conduct of Pennsylvania for the year 1755, etc.* In these he deplored the existence of an almost purely republican government in the province and charged its failure to protect its borders and other shortcomings to the Quaker majority in the Assembly and their supporters among the Germans. He recommended requiring an oath of allegiance from all members of the Assembly, which of course would exclude the Quakers; withholding the suffrage from the Germans till they had learned the English language, which would disfranchise them at least for the moment; and the use of English alone in all legal documents. He proposed also that English Protestant schools should be established among the Germans to resist supposed Catholic propaganda, and that newspapers should all be in English or in two parallel columns, English and German. By other controversial articles Dr. Smith put himself clearly in opposition to the majority in the Assembly and to their supporters in Philadelphia. Braddock's defeat and the sad record of Indian atrocities on the border during the summer of 1755 seemed to justify Smith's position and gave added bitterness to the verbal attacks on the majority by the Proprietary party who were in the minority in the Assembly. The stronger Popular party based their continued refusal to make appropriations on the conditions insisted upon by the Governor. In conformity with his instructions, he vetoed every measure that required the Proprietors' estates to be taxed. On the other hand, the Popular party insisted on this taxation and charged the Governor's party, to which Smith belonged, with willingness to sell out their local liberties.

An anecdote of this time describes a group of gentlemen, of whom Smith was one, sitting in the coffee house at Front and

Market streets discussing political questions when one of them, a Mr. Roberdeau, remarked to Smith that he was "sorry a gentleman of his cloth had intermeddled in party affairs." Dr. Smith was said to have replied that he was not of one party more than another and that he only dressed the sentiments of the Proprietary side in proper language, that he was not excessively devoted to that party and would do the same for the other party if they needed it. He denied these words afterward and a controversy arose which drew into it members of the vestry of Christ Church, prominent Presbyterians, and some seventy leading citizens, including at least three of the College Trustees. It was a petty matter, but the Provost did not deny having shared in a discussion on current politics at the public coffee house. A letter writer in the *Journal* who signs himself Humphrey Scourge writes for the benefit of "a certain Parson," "I could wish for thy own sake and the sake of those under thy care that thee would behave more prudently and give less occasion of offense to the People."

Whether or not the Provost considered himself to be of one party more than another, others considered him partisan, for in the same year 1756 the Trustees found themselves forced to take cognizance of newspaper attacks charging him with using his position as a teacher to impress upon his students doctrines inconsistent with the constitution and the rights of the province. Fearing that such insinuations might do harm to the institution, a committee of the Board inquired into the matter but reported that there was no possibility of harm coming to the College and Academy from his behavior since the Trustees themselves had it constantly under observation. They described Dr. Smith's conduct as "becoming and satisfactory to us." Six students in the junior class also testified and proved by exhibiting their notebooks that the Provost had not taught them any partisan principles. The Trustees offered their report justifying him, for publication in the *Gazette*, their usual outlet for matters of interest to the College and the public; but David Hall, its publisher, supposedly under Franklin's influence, declined to print it on the ground that the original insinuations had not appeared in his paper, and that the matter savored of existing disputes, which he wanted to avoid.

Somewhat later, in 1758, the Provost was involved still more deeply in a political struggle, this time with the Assembly, then in a militant mood. Judge Moore of Moore Hall, a Chester County magistrate, had been charged with various offenses, principally of a political nature, by several petitioners who asked the Assembly to remove him from office. This the Assembly could not do, as his position was appointive, but after some investigation, it sent an address to the Governor asking him by his authority to remove Moore from all his public positions. This address, couched in terms of vigorous condemnation, was published in the newspapers. Moore waited for the adjournment of the Assembly, then published an equally vigorous attack upon that body. Smith, whose political opinions were the same as those of the Judge, was suspected of aiding in the composition of this offensive document and securing its publication in a German newspaper with which he had influence.

On the reassembly of the Legislature in January 1758, both Moore and Smith were ordered to appear at its bar on a charge of contempt. Moore was remanded to jail on the old complaint. Smith was charged with "promoting and publishing a false, scandalous, virulent and seditious libel against the late House of Assembly of this Province," but was offered release on apology and retraction. He refused to acknowledge guilt and was committed to jail along with Judge Moore. His efforts for release by interposition of the courts and the Governor failed, and he remained in prison for the next three months. He and his students joined in a request that during that time he be allowed to give his lectures as usual, even though they must be given in the jail; this was acceded to by the Board of Trustees. As there were but twelve students in Dr. Smith's classes at this time, even the limited accommodations of the old jail at Sixth and Walnut streets were sufficient, and so we have the picturesque incident of the Provost and Professor of Moral Philosophy giving his course of lectures in limbo.

The summer adjournment saw his release, but when the Assembly met in September, by a sort of cat and mouse procedure he was again placed in confinement and, on their dissolution, again released; the new Assembly that would meet in November

threatened his re-arrest. It was evident he would not be able to fulfill his college duties during the winter term and at his desire the Trustees gave him leave to go to England for six months to press an appeal from the Assembly to the Crown. The journey was to be made at his own expense, and his salary, at his suggestion, was to be paid to Reverend Mr. Ewing, a recent graduate from Princeton, who would teach his classes during his absence. The Trustees took this opportunity to compliment the Provost on his "great abilities and the satisfaction he had given them in the faithful discharge of his duties." When the sergeant at arms of the Assembly came to seek him he could not be found, and on December 12, 1758, he quietly sailed for England.

His appeal against the Assembly was successful, the Attorney-General advised the Privy Council in his favor, and the Council on his appearance before them placed in his hands a sharp rebuke to be presented to the Assembly, declaring the King's displeasure at their assuming to themselves powers which did not belong to them and invading at the same time the royal prerogative and the liberties of the subject, attributing to themselves for Pennsylvania the powers that Parliament claimed, somewhat questionably, for the whole empire. This declaration, on his return to Pennsylvania, Dr. Smith put in the hands of the Governor, who laid it without comment before the Assembly. It was a genuine but hollow victory for the Provost. It had no effect on the claims or practice of the Legislature and he received no damages.

Dr. Smith may, however, be considered to have won another and more substantial personal victory from this series of incidents, for at its close he married the daughter of his fellow prisoner of 1758, Judge Moore. Her sister had already married Dr. Bond, one of the Trustees, adding another to that group of family compacts which punctuates and complicates the history of the colonial College. There are some indications that, notwithstanding their resolutions complimenting him on the performance of his academic duties, the Trustees were not any too well pleased by the Provost's political activities. Chief Justice William Allen, who had refused to give him the writ of *habeas corpus*

for which he had asked, was a Trustee, and three others were members of the Assembly he had attacked.

It was in this period, apparently, that strained relations between Dr. Smith and Franklin developed. They could hardly have been avoided. Franklin was passing from a position of conciliator between parties to the recognized position of principal supporter of colonial as against Proprietary claims. He was no longer President of the Board of Trustees of the College, having yielded that position to Mr. Peters in May 1756, and shortly thereafter gone to England in the service of the Assembly. Even before he left America he had practically lost contact with the College. In a letter written from London, July 28, 1759, to his friend and colleague Professor Kinnersley, he remarks:

Before I left Philadelphia everything to be done in the Academy was privately preconcerted in a cabal, without my knowledge or participation, and accordingly carried into execution. The scheme of public parties made it seem requisite to lessen my influence wherever it could be lessened. The Trustees had reaped the full advantage of my head, hands, heart and purse in getting through the first difficulties of the design, and when they thought they could do without me they laid me aside.

After this time he was much abroad and seldom attended Trustees' meetings when he was at home. Only once was he present at a Commencement, and the almost complete Latinity of that occasion must have given little comfort to his rugged preference for the vernacular. His great services to the College were almost all given in the first eight years of its existence. Although he and Dr. Smith were both in England in 1759 and both had interviews with the Penns, Smith's warm and friendly, Franklin's cold and formal, they did not meet and Smith returned more definitely than ever a supporter of the Proprietary claims. In the exchange of abusive correspondence in the newspapers characteristic of the time, a letter dated April 15, 1756, usually attributed to Smith, referred to "the aspiring views of a certain mighty politician who expects that every person would fall down and worship the Golden Calf." That this refers to Franklin is

indicated by a reply to it the next week describing it as the work of "an infamous hireling against an absent person." An ill-natured attack upon Franklin appeared in the *American Magazine*, of which Smith was in control, charging him with claiming as his work electrical inventions that should rightly be ascribed to Kinnersley. Kinnersley himself, as already mentioned, wrote in protest against this charge, pointing out the difficulty of ascribing relative credit in joint observations. The same intimation that Franklin was dishonest or at least unfair to his coworker in their scientific interests is repeated in a prospectus of the College issued in 1758.

When Dr. Smith went to England for the collection of funds in 1764 he heard from a gossiping visitor, whom he describes as "an eminent Dissenter," a long and scarcely credible story of vilification of the College by Franklin and efforts by him to prevent the success of the Provost's mission. Neither the truth of the unnamed visitor's statement nor the fairness of Dr. Smith's report of it can be verified. Franklin left among his books a caustic inscription written on the fly-leaf of a pamphlet by Smith, and there was certainly no love lost between them, but such personal hostility as existed between these two eminent men had little influence on the fortunes of the College.

Those fortunes on the other hand were deeply affected by the continuing disputes between the Penns and the Assembly. Antagonism to the Proprietors lies at the basis of unexpected hostility to the College which developed at this time. It will be remembered that between 1757 and 1764 the College was principally supported by a series of lotteries. In 1758 there began to appear in what might be called, from the College point of view, the "opposition" newspaper, that is the *Journal*, a series of articles signed "Pennsylvanius," sharply criticizing the prevailing practice of lotteries. A controversialist soon appeared who not only disputed these arguments but charged the author of them with having the ulterior purpose of attacking the lottery-supported College. "Pennsylvanius" acknowledges that this is so and asserts that the College is an enemy to the liberties of the province, and that, so long as it can be supported by lotteries it will continue to act as an abettor of Proprietary tyranny. He claims that

its charter was drawn up by Richard Peters, an agent of the Proprietaries, and was granted by Thomas and Richard Penn without provision for any local influence on the membership of its Board of Trustees, just so that it might remain an adjunct of tyrannical control by the Proprietary family. In fact "*Pennsylvanius*" declared that if the lotteries could be made to fail and the Penn-patronized College be thus sufficiently impoverished, another college, based on local interests, loyal to the people's cause and supported by the public, could and would be established—almost a prophecy of what happened twenty years later.

All these charges, inflated as they were, were denied, reasserted, and discussed in endless columns of small print in the newspapers. In January 1759 the Faculty, stung apparently by some of the charges, called the attention of the Trustees to their unfairness and asked liberty to reply to them. The Trustees, however, by unanimous action, asked the professors not to make any reply, since the persons making the criticisms were "some low creatures who wrote from Passion and Resentment," and neither their arguments nor their calumnies could hurt the College or its teachers or administrators.

These disputes were all long ago, and on whose side truth and justice lay is of little importance to us now, even if it were discoverable. What is of significance is that the College was not able to pursue its quiet way as an educational institution and to seek support from all classes, but was, rightly or wrongly, subjected to suspicion and antagonism as the protégé and instrument of one party and the opponent of another. In these conflicts lay the greatest obstacle to the current success and the future fortunes of the College.

The year 1764 saw a culmination of the long struggle between the Assembly and the Proprietaries. The Assembly, unable, as it felt, to make good its claims to self-government as against the Proprietors, in May 1764 appealed to the King to take the government of the province directly into his hands. It was appealing from a nearer to a more distant master, hoping to receive better consideration. Such transfer of government from the Proprietary family to the King had been in turn projected and approved at one time by William Penn, at another by the royal

government itself, and now by the Provincial Assembly. Franklin, who as a member of the Assembly had been active in securing the passage of the proposed act of surrender, was now chosen to go to England to present it to the King. His selection as agent seemed to give new bitterness to the internal party struggle in Pennsylvania. He himself published, early in the year, *Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs*. They were not too cool, however, to bring as rejoinders at least two pamphlets, *The Plain Dealer* and *What is Sauce for the Goose is also Sauce for a Gander*, by Hugh Williamson, Professor of Mathematics in the College.

It is to be remembered in noting these attacks on Franklin that he had not yet performed those great national services which made all Americans grateful to him and gave him almost complete immunity from criticism. Moreover the popular party in Pennsylvania, of which he was supposed to be the leader, was so heterogeneous that no one man, not even a Franklin, could give unity to its aims. Party conflict was then of a bitterness and abusiveness unknown in modern times. Scurrility in verse and satire in prose load the columns of the provincial newspapers. A protest against the choice of Franklin was issued in October 1764 which declared him unsuitable on many grounds, claiming that "his selection is so disagreeable to many in Pennsylvania that it will inflame the resentments and embitter the hearts of the good people of the Province."¹ The war of pamphlets which broke out seemed to justify this prophecy.

Political pamphlets rained from the printing presses. Several of them involved the College. Four of the Trustees signed the protest. Vice-Provost Alison and Professor Ewing were among the signers of a protest of leading Presbyterians and Baptists against the petition to the Crown; Provost Smith arrived home from his two years of collecting funds in England just in time

¹ In 1763 William Allen, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and one of the Trustees, said of Franklin in a company in York, England, including some Americans and some British, "I can assure you that he is a man so turbulent and such a plotter as to be able to embroil the three kingdoms if he ever have an opportunity." Perhaps, fifteen years later when Allen was in exile in England as a Tory and Franklin was American minister in France, he felt even more sure of his estimate of the man.

to add a preface and new bitterness to a published speech of John Dickinson condemning the opposition to the Proprietors and depreciating the influence of Franklin. The popular leader Galloway published a reply, to which Franklin in his turn added a preface which is one of the most pungent of his political writings. He pays his respects to his colleagues among the Trustees and to the Provost by observing "for the Comfort of old Sinners that in Politics as well as in Religion Repentance and Amendment though late shall obtain Forgiveness . . . and P[eters] should preach your funeral Sermon and S[mith], the Poisoner of other's characters, embalm your Memory." He also published *Remarks on a late Protest*, hinting that the real author of the *Protest* was Smith, "the dear delight and constant employment" of whose life it has been "to murder all reputations that stand in his way." However, he concludes this pamphlet, as he leaves home in 1764 for what proved to be a seven-year mission, on a somewhat ironic note of forgiveness: "I am now to take leave, perhaps last leave, of the country I love and in which I have spent the greatest part of my life. *Esto perpetua*. I wish every kind of prosperity to my friends; and I forgive my enemies."

These differences among serious-minded men were differences concerning politics, not concerning the College, which suffered from them only indirectly. There were publications by others that were scarcely so loyal. Isaac Hunt was a student from Barbados who was graduated in 1763; he was for some months after graduation a tutor in the Latin School, then studied law in a desultory way in Philadelphia. In 1764 he published a pamphlet attack on the Proprietaries, *A Letter from a Gentleman in Transylvania to his Friend in America*, described at the time as "highly reflecting on the Government of this Province." The next year he published *A Humble Attempt at Scurrility; In Imitation of Those Great Masters of the Art, the Rev. Dr. S—th, the Rev. Dr. Al—n, and the Rev. Mr. Ew—n*, a really scurrilous attack on his College. This was followed by a series of papers, professedly emanating from the College, which he described as *Exercises in Scurrility Hall*. In 1766 he had the effrontery to apply for his degree of M.A., which would normally be given him in that year. The Trustees, however, after keeping him waiting for their de-

cision in an outer room, sent out word that they considered him unworthy of further honors from a seminary that he had malign'd in writings "unworthy of a good man or Person of Education."

Hunt was much aggrieved and wrote to his patron, Franklin, protesting; the Trustees, however, eventually withdrew their objection and gave him his degree in 1771. Hunt was an inveterate if not always a consistent participant in political discussions, and his part in those of a decade later, on the eve of the Revolution, when he was on the conservative side, led to his seizure by a Philadelphia mob which took him through the streets in a cart and threatened to tar and feather him. By judicious good humor he carried the affair off without actual violence. However, before independence was declared he left the country, went back to Barbados for a time, then to England, where he was ordained against the protest of Dr. Smith and other American Anglicans. In 1778 and 1779 he was reputed to be the author of a bitter attack on Dr. Smith published in the Philadelphia newspapers, which led to a long defense by Dr. Smith. He was the father of Leigh Hunt, who in his literary rebellion against authority followed the parental example.

The College was occasionally made use of by some of those enlightened Englishmen who, in the early stages of the growing alienation between the mother country and the colonies, thought it still possible to come to satisfactory terms. In 1762 an English merchant and member of Parliament, John Sargent, approached Franklin in London and expressed a wish to provide two gold medals to be offered by the College, one, no doubt for the sake of the proprieties, for the best production on classical lines, the other for the best essay on the great subject of the day, "The Reciprocal Advantages arising from a Perpetual Union between Great Britain and her American Colonies." Mr. Sargent's political objects were evident, notwithstanding his claim that the prizes were intended merely to show his good will to the College, in his desire that the decision should be made by Franklin, agent for Pennsylvania, Isaac Norris, Speaker of the Assembly, and some third person whom they should choose.

Franklin, not desiring to be held responsible for this over-

ture, and Norris, already doubtful of the desirability of such a perpetual union, hastened to turn the whole matter over to the Board of Trustees. In their hands it lay dormant for three years. In the spring of 1766, when the Stamp Act controversy had brought the whole question into prominence, the medal for the political essay was offered, to be competed for by anyone who held a degree from the College, and the offer was published in the Philadelphia newspapers. Nine essays were presented, under assumed names. A group of the Trustees assisted by some of the professors gave the whole of a long May day to their examination and three proved to be of unusual excellence. They were all by holders of the degree of M.A. from the College. The best was declared to be that of Dr. John Morgan, the recently appointed Professor of Medicine. At the succeeding Commencement he was given the gold medal with flattering ceremonies and read his essay as part of the exercises. The three chosen essays, with a fourth, by Francis Hopkinson, on the same subject but not submitted in the competition, were printed in a volume that is now a collector's prize. They would justify recapitulation here as an indication of the political views of the time, if space were more abundant.

In the increasing tension between the British and the colonial governments the College was unavoidably involved. In the opposition to the Stamp Act and in the successive meetings of Committees of Correspondence and of Safety, from 1771 to 1776, Dr. Smith, members of the Board of Trustees, and alumni were constantly represented. There were too many men in Pennsylvania who held degrees from the College or were connected with it by office or by kinship with its Trustees or graduates to make it possible that it should remain entirely outside such stirring events; the names of Smith, Mifflin, Clymer, Willing, Morris, Franklin, and others familiar in College annals appear constantly in connection with the active political movements of the day.

Revolution was in the air, and soon the volunteer bands of soldiers intruded upon the routine of scholastic life. As the provincial troops began to gather, the hall, the classrooms, and the College yard offered irresistible attraction to the officers who had to provide for the accommodation of these men. In 1775

troops from Chester County were billeted on the College. In December 1776 the Trustees hold no meeting, "the Schools being broke up by public alarms." In January 1777 the Provost, Vice-Provost, and professors join in an appeal to the Council of Safety, the highest military authority in Philadelphia, for consideration, declaring that troops have been repeatedly placed in the College, that rooms have been broken into and used, that the College firewood has been burnt, and "before we could well clear away the Dirt and Filth left by one Set of Soldiers and meet again in our places another set has been forced upon us." At the time they are writing there are about one hundred and fifty soldiers occupying the premises, and the yard is crowded with horses and wagons.¹ In February Vice-Provost Alison expects that the College will soon have to be broken up "as in the Jerseys."

Six months later, in June 1777, they gave up the effort to hold classes and the College was closed. September 1777 the British occupied the city. They used the College buildings for one of their military hospitals, and for the next four months an average of forty sick or wounded were treated there. The British Hospital Board of three physicians and six citizens held their regular weekly meetings there. In April 1778, on appeal from Provost Smith, they evacuated two of the rooms, and in June the British troops were withdrawn from the city.

It may be remarked that the Revolution was having much the same effect on all American colleges. War periods are no time for academic prosperity; *togae cedunt armis*. In New York the buildings of King's College were taken over for military purposes by the American troops April 6, 1776, and continued to be occupied by them, and by the British after they captured the city a few weeks later, until the British troops abandoned them in 1783. Although there was a semblance of academic life carried on in a private house, the College was practically in abeyance till its reorganization by an act of the Legislature May 12, 1784, similar to the Pennsylvania act of 1779, "for granting certain privileges to the college heretofore called King's College, for altering the name and charter thereof, and erecting an Univer-

¹ *Pennsylvania Archives*, Series I, vol. 5, pp. 198-99.

sity within the state." In Providence the building of the institution which was to become Brown University was taken over December 1776 for the use first of the American then of the French troops, and restored to academic use only in June 1782. At Harvard, as might have been expected, military interference with college life began early, but lasted, so far as the use of its buildings was concerned, but a short time. In May 1775 the provincial troops commandeered the four buildings of the College and quartered some 1,600 soldiers in them, while the President and professors and a handful of students migrated to Concord. But in April 1776, the British withdrew from Boston, the American troops were transferred elsewhere, and the President, tutors, and students returned to their old quarters. The interior wood-work of the buildings had been defaced and brass doorknobs and locks had disappeared, half a ton of lead from the roofs had been melted into bullets, and the bad condition of one of the buildings had been made so much worse that it was never rebuilt. Through the remainder of the Revolution Harvard was under a cloud, an average of less than a hundred and fifty professors, tutors, students, and servitors being in Cambridge at any one time, and the number of graduates falling off to less than thirty a year. Even those who were there were inferior to their predecessors.¹

In Philadelphia, after the retirement of the British, the Provost and the few remaining professors and tutors gathered the students together as best they could for the remainder of 1778; January 9, 1779, it was announced that "The different Schools of the College and Academy . . . are open for the education of Youth upon the usual plan." The Trustees and Faculty were preparing to hold a Commencement in June when an intimation from the new government of the state that a serious change in the status of the College was in contemplation by the Legislature made any such attempt to resume the former tenor of events evidently impracticable.

If the Revolutionary troubles of the College had been only a matter of injury to its buildings, interruption to its teaching, and even the defection of a certain number of Tory Trustees, on

¹ S. E. Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard*, Cambridge, 1936, pp. 133-169.

the restoration of peace its buildings might have been cleaned up, its classes gathered, and its administration resumed under the remaining Trustees. But in Pennsylvania there had been not merely an external but an internal revolution. In securing independence and arming for war, a new political party and a lower social class had come into control of the affairs of the state.

This party, although led chiefly by men of position and ability, had as its supporters many uneducated but not unthinking radicals, who had had no adequate and legitimate means of expressing themselves. They were to be found among the tens of thousands who had gathered a generation before to listen to Whitefield, and among the half-million who bought and thrilled at edition after edition of Paine's *Common Sense*. They made up a part of the four or more thousands that filled Chestnut Street and the adjacent squares in response to the call of the City Committee in the mass meeting of May 1776, and thronged the space in front of Carpenter's Hall in June of the same year. They made a substantial element among the crowds that had turned back the *Charming Polly* and destroyed the cargo of tea on the *Polly Ayres* in the Delaware in the days following the news of the Stamp Act; they formed the crowds that urged on the hesitating steps by which their more moderate leaders advanced to ultimate revolution and independence. These elements of the population of Philadelphia had had no share or interest in the Academy and College, except possibly in the Charity School, the annals of which are unfortunately nonexistent. The leaders of the party which now controlled the government of the new state and carried through its first constitution, that of 1776, represented the ideas of these classes as well as their own. Pennsylvania had been an aristocracy; it became now, for a time at least, a democracy.

The College, if it be considered as represented by all who were connected with it as Trustees, as professors, as graduates, or as having studied in the Academy or the College, had played by no means an obscure or inglorious part in the Revolution. Twenty were members of the Continental Congress and nine had signed the Declaration of Independence. Major General Mifflin, Major Philemon Dickson, General Muhlenberg, Major General

Lambert Cadwalader, Anthony Wayne, Colonel Tilghman, and Colonel Morris were only the most distinguished of a crowd of Philadelphia Academy and College men who were conspicuous in the Continental army or in the military forces of one or other of the states. John Morgan of the first graduating class and the founder of the Medical School was the first Director-General of Hospitals and Physician-in-Chief of the American army, and when, as a result of misunderstanding, jealousies, and inability to cope with a hopeless situation, he was removed from office, it was only to be superseded by Dr. Shippen, his coadjutor in the Medical School; the medical officer in the army with perhaps on the whole the most distinguished permanent record was Dr. Jonathan Potts of the medical class of 1768. Indeed the priority of establishment of the Medical School placed upon its graduates of the preceding decade almost the whole responsibility of filling the higher medical positions not only in the Continental army but in the various bodies of state militia.

But there was another side to the record of patriotism. Some members of the Board of Trustees were actual Tories and withdrew to the British lines or to Great Britain itself. In the final vote on independence in the Continental Congress, of the three Trustees who were members, one voted for it, one against it, one refrained from voting. Others were of doubtful attachment to the new government, and they and members of their families had remained on pleasant terms with the British army of occupation in Philadelphia in 1777 and 1778. Jacob Duché of the Faculty lost heart for the contest and wrote Washington advising surrender. Many who had at first been warm defenders of American rights had held back when it came to separation from the mother country. Of such was Provost Smith; he had avoided any share in the movement for actual independence and had been allowed after the break-up of the College to go into retirement at his country place at the Falls of Schuylkill.

The politics of Revolutionary Pennsylvania are as complicated as those of colonial times, and there is no occasion to discuss them here, further than to trace their influence upon the College. The party already described which was now in power, the "Constitutional" party, the party which had been most vig-

orous in carrying through the Revolution and had secured the adoption of the radical constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, the most democratic of all the new state constitutions, was not satisfied with the College. Its loyalist tinge, its half-hearted support of the Revolution, its Anglican and aristocratic connections, the Toryism of some of its Trustees, the conservative party position of others, the questionable patriotism of its Provost, were all repugnant to the radical party now in control of the state government. It is therefore not a matter of surprise that the leaders of this dominant party felt and soon expressed hostility to the College. The first outcome of this was the passage by the state Legislature, January 2, 1778, when it was sitting at Lancaster during the British occupation of Philadelphia, of an act "For suspending the powers of the Trustees of the College and Academy of Philadelphia for a limited time." The Legislature complained that whereas the Vice-Provost, the professors, and some of the Trustees had left the city as the British entered it, others had remained and thereby voluntarily put themselves under the power of the British enemy; some had even joined the British forces. The act provided that no action of the Trustees should be valid as long as the British remained in possession of the city and for three months afterwards.¹

The British evacuated the city June 18, 1778. On September 25, immediately upon the expiration of the period of suspension of their powers, the Trustees met and with the Faculty, as before observed, began the restoration of the College. Their efforts were futile. In the newspapers appeared letters charging Provost Smith with being a Tory, and his long replies in defense of his actions did nothing to win popular sympathy. When the Legislature met again in Philadelphia President Reed recommended anew to its consideration the question of the College. The constitution makers of 1776, in the exuberance of independence, had written into the constitution the proviso that there should be "one or more state universities," and now they proceeded to transform the old College to conform to their ideals.

On February 23, 1779, a committee was appointed to inquire into the state of the College and Academy, its rise, funds, etc.,

¹ Dunlap, *Laws Enacted in the Second General Assembly, Lancaster, 1778.*

and to report back to the Assembly. When the Board of Trustees at their meeting of March 1, a week later, were informed of this action, a committee was appointed to assemble the necessary information, to meet the committee of the Legislature and to obtain if possible a hearing before the whole Assembly. Provost Smith was of course asked to assist the committee, and with his usual skill and assiduity prepared the case for the College; in fact he had already prepared the material in anticipation of some such action, so that within a week the two committees met in the old College hall at Fourth and Arch streets and the case of the College was presented to the committee of the Assembly. This committee was not in itself a hostile one. Joseph Reed, President of the Assembly, who had suggested the action and made the appointment, was an honorary Master of Arts of the College, and George Clymer, the committee chairman, was about to be elected one of the Trustees. In the Assembly itself were several Trustees of the College.

The account of the origin, growth, ideals, and achievements of the College during the thirty years covered by the report was a dignified and a not unfair statement, although naturally somewhat exaggerated. The description of its present condition, being truthful, was not too pleasing. The number of students was less than at some former periods. There were in the three classes of the College twenty-two students, besides some forty medical students and some special attendants from the army on Dr. Smith's lectures on experimental philosophy. In the Academy there were fifty-seven scholars in the Grammar School and twenty-four in the English and Mathematical schools. Fifty-seven beside were enrolled in the Charity Schools. Some two hundred pupils under instruction at a time of such confusion was not an unworthy showing. The financial condition of the institution, due, as the Trustees claimed, to the "calamities of the times," was more unsatisfactory. By much calculation and careful estimation their budget was made to seem balanced, but they acknowledged that on account of the depreciation of the currency they had had to double the salaries of some of the teachers and would have soon to do the same for the rest; they would have to meet other increased costs. It would have been

hard at any time in the history of the College, except perhaps under the régime of lotteries, to have given a favorable report on its finances.

However, probably nothing that the report could have shown would have made much difference in the action of the legislators. They were determined to reconstruct the College. It was an institution of a past age, controlled by men representing ideas and a party distasteful to the majority of them. They wished to build a more democratic institution.

An adverse report of the legislative committee was a foregone conclusion. It was made, and a law in conformity with its recommendations was passed.¹ Three principal complaints were made the basis for the adoption of the law; first, that the Trustees had by a resolution passed in 1764 narrowed the "plan of free and unlimited catholicism" on which the College had been founded; secondly, that the charter required Trustees and professors and all connected with the College to take oaths of allegiance to the British Crown, which was evidently inconsistent with the independence of the state of Pennsylvania; that there was always danger in leaving institutions of learning "in the hands of dangerous and disaffected men"; and thirdly that the funds of the College were inadequate to the needs of proper education.

As to the first of these claims, about 1760 certain Anglican clergymen in Pennsylvania had become panicky about the advance of Presbyterianism, and had begun to fear that Presbyterians might come to control the College which, although founded on complete toleration, was through the Provost and the majority of the Board of Trustees under Church of England influences. By letters home they had conveyed their fear to the Archbishop of Canterbury and to Richard Penn, now a high Anglican.² The appeals for funds that Dr. Smith was then mak-

¹ November 27, 1779. *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania*, chap. 871, Vol. X, pp. 23-30.

² The Archbishop in a letter from Lambeth dated September 16, 1763, addressed to Rev. Jacob Duché in Philadelphia, says that he has had a letter from Rev. Hugh Neill, Anglican minister at Oxford, Pa., complaining that "the College of Philadelphia is dwindling away . . . into a mere Presbyterian Faction, that the number of Presbyterians among the Trustees increases, that of fifteen Teachers in the College all are Presbyterians except Dr. Smith and that they are endeavoring to destroy his influence and worm him out."—*Historical Collec-*

ing in England were based on the nonsectarianism of the College, but interested especially those who looked upon it as supporting the Church and providing capable Anglican teachers and missionaries. The Archbishop and Mr. Penn and Dr. Chandler, the latitudinarian representative of the Dissenters, thereupon despatched a letter to the Trustees urging them to make a rule that no party should be "put upon a worse footing" than they were at that time. The Trustees willingly passed such a regulation, which they all signed and which every new Trustee or other officer was required to sign on his election. Since notwithstanding the fears of the local clergy, at the time of the resolution, 1764, the Provost, Dr. Smith, was an Anglican, the Vice-Provost, Dr. Alison, a Presbyterian, and Professor Kinnersley a Baptist, the regulation seemed and was, a fair one, though the incentive was doubtless defense of the Anglican element, and the preponderance of churchmen on the Board of Trustees continued. In hostile eyes, however, it was a device of the aristocratic Anglican rulers of the College for their own protection; or the complaint may have simply been a specious excuse of those who wished to enact the law. The same may well be true of the complaint about the oaths and about the dangers to the peace of society and the stability of government if the College continued in the hands of men the majority party did not like.

The act proceeds to ratify and confirm to the College, excluding the by-law of 1764 mentioned above, its charters and all its estates and powers. It grants to the institution, in addition to its old property, a fund made up of confiscated estates which will produce an income of not more than £1,500 a year. It alters its old title from the College of Philadelphia to the University of the State of Pennsylvania. This change of title, or the creation of institutions with the title of "university," was widespread in the legislation and constitution-making of this time. That of Harvard in 1780 and Columbia in 1784 have just been mentioned; there was evident propriety in its use for the transformed institution in Pennsylvania. The old oaths to the Crown were now to be superseded, and those already prescribed for offi-

cials under the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were required to be taken by all connected with the University. Rules and ordinances past or prospective were to be conformable not to British law but to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Finally, and doubtless as the gist of the whole matter, the old Board of Trustees and Faculty were dissolved and deprived of all possession, control, or administration of the property and functions of the institution, and these were put into the hands of a new group of Trustees specified in the law.

The same number of Trustees, twenty-four, were to be appointed. Six of them were ex-officio, including the great state officers, the President and Vice-President of the Supreme Executive Council, the Attorney-General, certain judges, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The University was thus to be a state institution closely united with the government; six of the new Trustees were to be the senior members of each of the principal religious denominations of the city, including the Roman Catholic. Narrowing of the foundation would thus be prevented forever. Then there were twelve eminent citizens, named in the statute: Benjamin Franklin, of course, as the best-known man in the state, Shippen, Muhlenberg, and Searl, delegates at the time in Congress, but not appointed ex-officio, Timothy Matlack, Secretary, and David Rittenhouse, Treasurer of the state, but, again, appointed rather as citizens than as officers; five well-known judges and lawyers, and two physicians. The Board thus organized should have power to fill vacancies as they arose, in so far as these were not ex-officio, and with the provision that the state government had the power, if exercised within six months, of disallowing any such choice.

It has become customary to speak of this act of 1779 as an "abrogation of the charters." This is an incorrect expression, and an unfortunate one, for its use has led to the erroneous impression that there was a break in the continuity of the institution. It was not the charter but the Trustees and Faculty that were, if one may use the term, "abrogated." The very title of the law as it stands on the statute book, "An Act to Confirm the estates and interests of the college, academy and charitable school of the city of Philadelphia, and to amend and alter the charters

thereof, etc." makes this clear. The act of 1779 removed one set of Trustees and put another set in their place; it changed the name of the institution from College to University, the appropriateness of which title had been pointed out long before, and provided it with additional income; it substituted the name of the state for that of the city, and it required new oaths to the new government. In all this there was no breach of continuity. The old group of Trustees, unwillingly enough, it is true, and perhaps not legally, as a later Legislature declared, were deprived of their powers and privileges. A new group of men were given charge of the institution and some changes were made; but the charters were still intact. There was no "abrogation." The procedure, except for the involuntary character of one party's action, was somewhat like that by which the property and trusts of the Trustees of 1740 were handed over to those of 1749. The Board named in the act of 1779 may be looked upon as our third group of Trustees.

Though the transition from College to University in 1779 was one of unbroken continuity, the statute of that year nevertheless represents the close of the life of the old colonial College. It marked the end of an era. The Revolution was a social as well as a political revolution. It was not merely the connection with the British Crown or with the Penn family or the reign of Provost Smith that had come to an end, it was colonial life. A new world had come into being in which the University would have to play its part.

The period from 1740 to 1779 can be looked back upon as a whole. In it the College, Academy, and Charitable School had no insignificant position. The preceding narrative has chronicled frankly its weakness as well as its strength. The rule "nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice," has perhaps been even too strictly applied; but it requires no apologist or partial judge or over-loyal alumnus to state fairly the prominent part the College played in the life of the colonial city and adjacent region, in the training of influential men, and in the scientific, the literary, and artistic life of the city. It is doubtful whether it has at any time since been relatively so conspicuous or so influential in its immediate community.

Book II

THE MIDDLE PERIOD

1779-1829



Chapter 4

DIVISION AND REUNION

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, FROM 1779 TO THE REINSTATEMENT OF THE OLD TRUSTEES IN 1789

THE history of this period has been much neglected and even more misunderstood. Led by their sympathy with the displaced Provost, Trustees, and Faculty, and by their interest in the colonial College, by a mistaken reading of the law of 1779, and perhaps by their own political affiliations, earlier historians of the University have treated the decade from 1779 to 1789 as a lull in its activities, and have hastened on to the anticipated but, as it proved, abortive restoration of the old Provost, Trustees, and Faculty. The career of the University of the State was, however, of much interest, of devotion to their task on the part of the Trustees, and of intelligent efforts to broaden the curriculum and to make this, the earliest of all American state universities, worthy of its name.

The new Trustees lost no time in taking up their duties. Little more than a week elapsed between the last meeting of the old Board, November 22, and the first meeting of the new, December 5. The new Trustees met in the same hall as the old, in the building at Fourth and Arch streets. Nineteen of the twenty-four were present. They were a notable assembly, including many of the men who had made the Revolution in Pennsylvania and were now, for the time at least, in control of the destinies of the state. Joseph Reed, President of the Executive Council of the state, who, as has been indicated, had recommended the legislation which had resulted in the expulsion of the Board of Trustees of the College, was hardly a newcomer into its affairs. He had been a student there for two years and, after he had ob-

tained his A.B. at Princeton, received from it in 1766 the degree of M.A. He was elected President of the new Board and attended its meetings with regularity. William Moore, Vice-President of the state; Timothy Matlack, Secretary; John Bayard, Speaker of the Assembly; John Dickinson, Attorney-General; and Chief Justice McKean, Trustees *ex officio*, were all men of much political influence and at least two of them—Dickinson and McKean—among the ablest men Pennsylvania has produced.

It was a curious fate that made Francis Hopkinson, first in the list of graduates of the old College, bound to it by a score of ties and recently elected one of its Trustees, a Trustee of the University by virtue of his office as Judge of the Admiralty. Similarly Rev. William White, who was a graduate and M.A. of the College and had been one of its Trustees since 1774, was now as the leading Episcopal clergyman of the city, a Trustee of the University. Thomas Willing and Dr. Thomas Bond, named Trustees of the University as prominent citizens in the act of 1779, had also been members of the old Board.

The requirement of the law that the leading clergymen of the principal denominations should be on the Board led to the membership of Dr. White for the Episcopalians, Dr. Ewing for the Presbyterians, Dr. Kunze and Dr. Weiberg for the two branches of the Lutherans, and Father Farmer for the Roman Catholics. It was a far cry from 1756, when Dr. Smith had written to an English clerical correspondent that of the twenty-four Trustees of the College, fourteen or fifteen were regular churchmen and that “the church by soft and easy means daily gains ground in it.” It was remarkable also that in Quaker Philadelphia the Friends, because they had no ministers, had no representation on the Board, while the Roman Catholics, who had previous to the Revolution possessed no legal status, were now represented there. Franklin, whose name had as a matter of course been placed among the Trustees as an eminent citizen, was not in America at the time and did not take his seat on the Board even after his return.

No doubt that the University was a state institution was allowed to exist. In accordance with the requirement of the law, in addition to the oaths of allegiance and of fidelity to the state

government, the Trustees took a third oath, as state officials, for the faithful performance of their duties as Trustees. A new minute book was begun and duly adorned with a list of signatures as interesting and as impressive as those of 1749, though very different in significance. The claim made for the old Board that it comprised "the pick of the representative men of the old families of Philadelphia" could not have been made of their successors because they were mostly new men and their prominence was largely based on their politics. Their second meeting was held in the State House, as if to accentuate their position as a state body, and subsequent meetings were frequently held there. The lesser seal of the state was declared for the time to be the seal of the University. The names of the new Trustees as they came to be elected were laid before the Legislature for confirmation or, if the power was exercised within six months, rejection. The Trustees also looked forward hopefully to the financial support to which the law according to which they held their office entitled them.

The first consideration of the new Trustees was necessarily an examination of the past. The charters of 1753 and 1755 upon which their fundamental powers were based were extracted from the archives and read aloud at one of their meetings. The old minute books were obtained from Dr. Smith and a committee was appointed to examine the formerly approved plan of education, to indicate which portions should be continued, which altered, and which abandoned. They were to find the names and the rates of pay of the former professors and the number of students in the College and lower schools. The old Faculty had been dissolved along with the Board of Trustees; Vice-Provost Alison had died November 28, 1779, and Provost Smith was intentionally disregarded as representing all to which the new administration was opposed; the other professors of the College—Davidson, Oliphant, and Heffernan—and the medical professors were asked to continue with their work for the time. Notices were to be given that tutors for the Latin, English, and Mathematical schools would be wanted.

To wrest the institution immediately from the long-accustomed hands of Dr. Smith was no light matter. He made no

objection to handing over the charters and the minute books and the use of the buildings, but when he was asked to deliver the seal and the keys of the College he procrastinated. Neither the accounts of the College nor his own charges were, he declared, yet settled. When he was informed that his successor was asking for the occupancy of the Provost's house, he resolutely declined to yield possession. It was not until after repeated demands, and until almost a year had passed, and actual legal process for his expulsion had been served upon him that he gave way, appeared before the Board in person and signed an agreement to hand over all the keys and move from his dwelling on a certain date. At the same time he asked for an advance of money on his unsettled accounts. This was declined, though only by a tie vote. Soon the finance committee could report that all the keys of the buildings and all the securities of the old College were in their hands and that Dr. Ewing, the head of the University, was occupying the Provost's house.

It was not till many years later, however, that Dr. Smith's accounts were finally settled. He was then allowed a pension for life of £100 per year in currency, in acknowledgment of the old grant of half that sum in sterling made to him by the Trustees in 1764 when he returned triumphantly from collecting money in England. Certain other unsettled claims were included.

It was at an early meeting of the Board that Professor Ewing was elected Provost. President Reed of the Trustees and some others would have preferred to conciliate the more conservative elements by electing some other Episcopalian in Dr. Smith's place, perhaps Dr. Johnson of Columbia, but party feeling was too strong, so this learned Presbyterian minister-scientist was elected the institution's second Provost. He was appointed also Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, though the Provost had traditionally lectured on moral not natural philosophy. As a result of this election as Professor and Provost he ceased to be a member of the Board of Trustees.

The Trustees had great ambitions. They created immediately two new professorships, one in astronomy, a popular interest of the day, to which David Rittenhouse was elected, the other in the classics to be taught in German. This was a recognition that

the University was a Pennsylvania, not merely a Philadelphia, institution, and a concession to the large part of the population of the state outside of the city which knew no other language. A "German School," where German-speaking boys could be prepared for the higher studies and where others could be taught German, was added to the earlier lower schools. Dr. J. C. Kunze, a Lutheran clergyman, a graduate of Halle, was elected Professor of German and Oriental Languages, and, after he was drawn away to New York, a Dr. Helmuth was elected. Rittenhouse was elected Vice-Provost.

Rittenhouse was now in the midst of his great career, already famous for his reports on the transits of Mercury and Venus, for his success in determining the boundaries between four pairs of states, and for the construction of the orreries for Princeton and Philadelphia. He was an honorary Master of Arts of Philadelphia, of Princeton, and of William and Mary. He was also prominent at the Philosophical Society, where he succeeded Franklin as President; but he was not good material for a professor or a Vice-Provost. He was not interested in teaching or administration, and soon resigned to become again a Trustee; but his massive knowledge, his ingenuity, and his interest remained at the disposal of the University. Soon afterward Robert Patterson began his long and interesting career by offering a course of lectures on electricity, where would be exhibited "New and interesting experiments never yet exhibited at any public lectures in this city." The lectures were given three times a week at eleven in the morning and repeated at six o'clock in the evening. He also taught undergraduates.

The ambitions of the Trustees extended beyond individual replacements or extensions. One of the earliest of their committees was appointed to propose a plan for a "University education" and a "Faculty of the University." The successive reports of this committee gave occasion for repeated "cool and impartial examination" of the question and for many proposals by individual members. Dr. White would have added a professor of divinity to the Faculty, but this, like many other proposals, was laid on the table.

More than two years later the Board "after mature delibera-

tion" July 2, 1782, accepted the recommendation of the committee. It was an interesting and enlightened plan of college education. It provided for seven professorships; in natural philosophy, moral philosophy including metaphysics and logic, the Latin and Greek classics, the Oriental and German languages, history, mathematics, English, and oratory. Appointees were named or confirmed to each of these, Provost Ewing to the first, the Vice-Provost to the second. Provost Ewing was already giving the course of lectures on what he called "natural experimental philosophy," that he continued to give yearly, and which was ultimately edited and printed by his colleague Robert Patterson. It was this interest that led him to give his patronage a few years afterward to John Fitch, whose experiments on the steam-boat led to his short period of successful voyaging on the Delaware in 1790 and 1791. When Rittenhouse resigned his professorship and the Vice-Provostship, Reverend Samuel Magaw, a graduate of the class of 1757 and Rector of St. Paul's Church, a more adequate teacher though a much less distinguished man, was elected to that position. James Davidson, who had long been professor in the College, continued to teach the classics. The "Oriental languages" which Dr. Kunze was appointed to teach no doubt stood for Hebrew, to be taught to those preparing to be clergymen. Dr. Kunze was also to take charge of the German School, a flourishing department at the time. Robert Patterson, Professor of Mathematics, was to have charge also of the school teaching "practical mathematics," arithmetic, and bookkeeping. Archibald Gamble, who had recently been elected Professor of English and Oratory, was also to be Master of the Grammar School, in which would be taught "the English, Latin and Greek Languages, with such others as the Trustees might appoint," evidently the old English School now merged in the general preparatory school for the College. The professorship of history, to be filled by Robert Davidson, brother of the Professor of the Classics, who was also to teach chronology and geography, was an innovation; so far as appears in our own history and that of other colleges it was perhaps an isolated instance of the treatment of history as a separate subject for more than half a century.

That which was most distinctive of this plan, however, was

its replacement of the old "Philosophical School" by four parallel groups of studies, an anticipation of the modern elective system. If a student after complying with somewhat simple entrance requirements, which included some Latin and Greek, ability to "read English with propriety," and to write a fair hand, remained in any one of these groups four years he would obtain his Bachelor's degree. The Grammar School would prepare for all four of the parallel courses. Provision was made for special students, who would get no degree, and for students transferred from other colleges. The group of professors was to be an organized Faculty, to meet from time to time, to keep minutes in a "bound book," and to exercise certain rather circumscribed powers under the general control of the Board of Trustees. These rules were extended five years later into a regular code of "Laws and Rules for the good government and discipline of the students and Schools in the University of Pennsylvania"; minute rules for attendance, fines and other punishments were introduced, with reservation of the right to appeal from the Faculty to the Trustees. These rules were to be read aloud every three months, and 150 copies were printed for distribution. These seem to be the first set of the frequently amended by-laws of the University.

It is not to be supposed that this ambitious plan came fully into existence at the University. It was rather an ideal which poverty, politics, and shortness of time doomed to remain unfulfilled. Its interest lies largely in its ideals and proposals, so much more extensive than the College curriculum. Yet for some years education was carried on more or less in conformity with this system and under these instructors.

The reorganization of the medical courses was more difficult than that of the College. The effect of the Revolution on these courses had been more destructive; all who could do medical service had been, indeed in 1779 still were, in the army. The Trustees promptly after their organization appointed a committee made up of their members who were physicians "to inquire into the state of the late Medical School as it stood in the late College." They went further and asked their committee to look into the position of medical teaching in foreign universities and

to digest a plan for the consideration of the Board "for establishing the school on the most respectable footing." This resolution, adopted at the meeting of December 1779, is apparently the first time the group of medical courses is spoken of as a "School" distinct from the other courses given in the College. Some months later this committee is again urged to report its plan for the establishment of a medical school. The conception of the medical courses as a separate department of the University was evidently by this time a familiar one. To get it organized was not so easy.

Old personal and political jealousies still survived. When Dr. Shippen was reelected, or rather retained, both Dr. Morgan and Dr. Rush refused to serve. A bitter exchange of angry charges in the newspapers, in which such appellations as "Hell-cat" and "Dr. Spitfire" were used by the principals or their supporters, extended through the years 1780 and 1781. Dr. Hutchinson and Dr. Tilton successively declined the vacant chair of chemistry. However, Dr. Rush finally yielded and began again to lecture, Dr. Shippen included surgery and midwifery in his anatomy and physiology, Dr. Bond added theory and practice to his clinical lectures, and so with some changes of title the old group was by 1783 reconstructed. Notwithstanding some informality of position and title, teaching, examinations, and the granting of degrees continued through the whole period. There is no reason to believe that any student was given a medical degree without proof of a reasonable amount of professional preparation, nor was there any break in the continuity of the institution, so far as its medical work was concerned. The long-delayed plan for the organization of a new medical school on advanced lines and with more formal requirements for the grant of degrees in medicine was laid before the Trustees in March 1788, but that was, as will be seen, a difficult time in the history of the University, and the whole proposal was laid on the table.

The Medical School and the Department of Arts were brought together by their common dependence on the action of the Board of Trustees, though the Medical School possessed a certain degree of independence. During this period the two departments had joint Commencements. In 1779, as will be re-

membered, the College, due to official interposition, held no Commencement, but in 1780 the University gave appropriate degrees to the students who had been examined for their degrees in 1779 and had completed their work under either the College or the University. There proved to be eight receiving A.B., the same number M.A., two bachelors and one doctor of medicine, besides seven who were granted honorary degrees. Among the latter it is interesting to find the name of Thomas Paine given the degree of M.A. by unanimous vote of the Trustees at a meeting at which four clergymen were present. *Common Sense* had been published and had done its effective work for the success of the American Revolution; the *Rights of Man* and the *Age of Reason* had not yet been written or issued, to scandalize state and church. The next year six degrees were given in arts, eight in medicine, and there were six honorary degrees.

The average number of students, old and young, of Academy and College and Medical School, who gathered daily in the old building on Fourth Street during this decade was about 250; in 1784, the climax of this period, it ran up to four hundred. Of these some thirty-five or forty were in the college proper, from which an average of eight or nine took their degree of A.B. each year; it was the day of small things. There were usually six or eight Masters of Arts, and some honorary degrees were given. It seems impracticable, from the nature of their registration, to find from the records how many students were taking work with the medical professors, but in March 1784 there were said to be sixty medical students in attendance, and at the next Commencement eight took the degree of Bachelor of Medicine. This was about the average of those who each year took medical degrees, either as Bachelors or Doctors.

Without quite the éclat of colonial occasions, Commencements and other University functions were by no means without attraction to the public; sometimes they offered excitement. At the Commencement of July 4, 1781, for instance, although it was "on the Anniversary of our Glorious Revolution," as one of the newspapers describes it, and attended by the President and members of Congress, the President and Executive Council of the State, the family of the Minister of France, officers of the army,

and other persons of distinction, proceedings were suddenly halted while one of the students, Francis Murray, was in the midst of an address the announced subject of which was Major André. The Provost and the Trustees who were present went into an adjoining room where it was explained by the Provost that the speaker was using certain expressions about Major André that he had been strictly forbidden by the Faculty to use. The Board immediately withdrew his name from the list of those who were to receive their degrees. He was subsequently called before them but was recalcitrant, insisting that he said what he did because he thought he ought to say it, although he acknowledged that it had been forbidden. A year later, however, he had changed his mind and petitioned for his degree, stating that his action had been due to the "indiscretion of unreflecting youth." The Trustees committed the matter to a special committee and to the Faculty, and it was only after several months that all concerned were placated. Murray's name appears as an A.B. of 1781 though he never appeared again at Commencement and he did not receive the automatically bestowed M.A. till a year later than the rest of his class. It would be interesting to know what Mr. Murray said about Major André; whether it was unpatriotically favorable, due to the pleasant impression that young English officer had left in Philadelphia during the occupation three years before, or whether, echoing the anger caused by Arnold's treason of the previous year in which André was the intermediary, it was unduly harsh, gloating over a fallen and unfortunate foe, is not told. Unfortunately official minutes are barren soil for the growth of human interest.

This was a year of excitement in civic and University circles. In 1781 Philadelphia was the capital of the country as well as its largest city. It was here that Congress was sitting and here that the representatives of foreign alliances were stationed. The public theatre was closed by act of Congress, but the University students did what they could to fill the void. Early in March, although in February there had been a prohibition by the Trustees of any plays to be given without previous permission, the students produced *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country*. This was a patriotic play written in England fifty years before,

its performance at that time forbidden by the censor, presumably because of its glorification of rebellion. Now it was given in the old hall at Fourth and Arch, attended by "thousands," according to ex-Provost Smith, who went to hear it and came away sore in body from the crowding, vexed in spirit at the shouting and ill-behavior of the populace, "like a bull-baiting," he says, and, we may believe, ill pleased to see others occupying his house and in control of what he still calls "the College."

We have a spirited account of the occasion from a southern lady, Martha Blaine, daughter of a member of Congress from Virginia and a friend of Nancy Shippen, whom she is visiting. She writes that she has been enjoying the "Gay Scenes" of Philadelphia, attending the balls and "oratorios" given by the French minister. She has gone to a play given by the students, "Where there was the greatest crowd I ever saw." With Nancy Shippen, Mr. Otto, and Chevalier Marbois of the French legation and Don Francisco of Spain they drove to the University at five o'clock but found several hundred people in the yard watching for the opening of the doors. After driving around a few blocks they returned to find the doors open but people climbing up the walls and over the heads of the others "as if Garrick had been there." Her party formed a line by holding hands to get through the crowd and through the passage and up the stairs, but had to give up and retire to one of the classrooms "until the hurly-burly was over."¹ Could there have been any connection between this *Gustavus Vasa*, and the "Gustavus," used as a pseudonym by Arnold in his treasonable correspondence with General Gates? And had Francis Murray, the defiant orator of July 1781, taken part in the play four months before? There are unfortunately no answers.

When the news of Yorktown came to Philadelphia, in December of the same year, the Trustees and Faculty of the University sent resolutions of congratulation to Washington apprising him of their participation in the general joy and their special gratitude for the assurance his victory offers them for the development of the arts of peace. Washington and his family, the President and members of Congress, the President and Execu-

¹ *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, January 1935.

tive Council of Pennsylvania, and the Minister of France and his family and attachés, all then present in Philadelphia, were invited guests at the Commencement of 1782. The next year the bonds with the Father of his Country were drawn still closer, for at the commencement held on July 4, 1783, with his consent the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon him, for "joining the wreath of Science to the Laurels of the Hero." The degree had to be conferred *in absentia*, for he was just then in New York, but he sent a graceful acknowledgment, and when he passed through Philadelphia on his way to Annapolis six months later to resign his commission to Congress, the diploma and address were presented to him and acknowledged by him in person.

Close upon the congratulations to Washington came a similar ascription of honors to Franklin, who at last, in September 1785, returned to Pennsylvania after his long diplomatic career abroad. Among the various groups in Philadelphia who presented him with their felicitations were the Faculty of the University, led by the Provost and Vice-Provost. With numerous allusions to his instrumentality in its foundation, and calling attention to its recent restoration to its original "broad and catholic bottom" as he had planned it, for so they described the legislation of 1779, they expressed the hope that they might enjoy his approval and continued patronage during this the eve of his long and distinguished life. Whether or not the old man smiled inwardly at hearing the same words used to him that he had heard long before applied so improperly, as he contended, to the Penns, and whether he interpreted the law of 1779 as they did, he answered with appreciation of their compliments and expressions of good wishes equal to theirs. But he did not take the seat on the Board of Trustees to which he had been named in the law of 1779. The next year his election as President of the Executive Council of the State made him in addition a Trustee *ex officio*; but there is no record of his attendance. Three years later, when his term as President had expired and the conservatives were in power, his name was dropped from the list of Trustees for non-attendance.

In December 1782 the honorary degree of LL.D. was conferred on two distinguished French travelers, the Chevalier de Chastellux, and François Barbé de Marbois, and of M.D. on a Dr. Coste,

Physician-General to the French army. Chastellux was one of those young French officers who came over with Rochambeau and the French troops in the summer of 1780. He saw much of Washington, admired him and became much attached to him. In addition to his military duties he made two journeys, one in the northern the other in the southern section of the country. On both excursions he visited Philadelphia and in his *Voyages*, written after his return to France, gives interesting observations made during his visit to the city. He met Ewing and Rittenhouse, visited the University, and was, as just remarked, given its highest degree. He was also elected a member of the Philosophical Society.

He was charmed with his treatment here and elsewhere in America and on his return to France he urged Count Vergennes to recommend to the King to send a gift of books for the library of the Philadelphia institution. He had visited and been honored in the same way at Williamsburg in Virginia and made a similar recommendation to Vergennes for William and Mary. The books arrived for both institutions the next year, 1784. There were a hundred handsome volumes for each. Those given to Pennsylvania were largely works by French writers on science and natural history, suggested presumably by the known interests of Franklin and by the reports of the French botanists who had visited America. There were thirty-three titles, one of them a collection of the works of Buffon in thirty volumes. The Trustees acknowledged the gift in a courteous, almost fulsome, letter, considering that it emanated from a group of newly made republicans. It expressed their recognition of the "honor his most Christian Majesty has done them by extending his Royal attention to the Advancement of Science . . . with so magnificent a Donation." Chastellux was so proud of this correspondence, which he described as *très élégante et éloquente*, that he had it printed in the *Mercure de France*.¹

French politics were already extending to America, and the *Courier de l'Amérique*, an anti-royalist periodical started in Philadelphia in the very month of the receipt of the books, pub-

¹ See University of Pennsylvania *Library Chronicle*, Vol. II, Nos. 3 and 4, where a catalogue of the books is given.

lished a scornful but quite unmerited criticism of them. All but six volumes are still preserved in the University Library, although until quite recently they have been on the open shelves, and subject to depredation. The College of William and Mary has not been so fortunate; a destructive fire has left only one volume of the original one hundred.¹

Probably because of the semi-public character of the University, outside organizations felt more free to ask for the use of its rooms for their meetings, when they were not in use for purposes of instruction, than in the time of the College. Demands upon it in 1781 and again in 1784 by a group of Baptists, in 1782 by a German Lutheran congregation; by a congregation of Scots Presbyterians in 1786, are reminiscent of the original object of the building, though in so different a world. The American Philosophical Society, while awaiting the completion of its own building operations, was given the use of one of the University's rooms. The Constitutional Society in 1783 is allowed to meet in the Latin School, and Mr. Adgate's singing society in 1784 in the English School. The well-known interest in music in the Philadelphia of this period is reflected in demands on the University's rooms. Although the organ which had been installed in the old Hall in 1760 had broken down and was removed and sold for £25 in 1785, the Uranian Society, a musical organization, was, at the request of one of the Trustees, allowed to meet here in the winter of 1786; another Trustee, representing the Society for Promoting Psalmody, advocated, though unsuccessfully, the application of Mr. Adgate to become a regular teacher of music in the University.

From 1786 onward there appears to have been a rising movement of serious study among young men outside of the University circle but wanting to use its facilities. In January and February 1786 three societies, one of "young gentlemen of the law," another "the Medical Society," the third a group formed

¹ It is of interest to observe that the French Department of Education in 1937, 150 years after the royal gift, sent to Pennsylvania and to some other American colleges and universities which interest themselves especially in French literature, science, and art, an invitation to choose from an extensive list of French works up to the value of 20,000 francs as a gift from the Republic.

"for their mental improvement." like Franklin's Junto, were allowed various rooms in the University building. Most if not all of these groups met in the evening and therefore interfered little with the regular scholars. In 1787 a Junior Law Society asks permission to meet at the University. Their request is referred to the Chief Justice and a committee but no report is recorded. The Humane Society, formed to save people from drowning, obtains liberty to meet there in 1787, and an equally unexpected organization, the Agricultural Society, seeks permission to hear a short course of lectures on agriculture in 1788. At another time the Society for the Encouragement of Manufactures meets at the University.

There were frequent requests, some granted, some declined, for its use in the old field of "Experimental Philosophy"; at another time for the "Philosophy of Natural History." One claimant wants to make use in his lectures of the University's apparatus; but this, on advice of the Provost, is declined. There was more than one instance of use for a period of one of the rooms in the evening for an English, a French, or a German school. In June 1781 the managers of a Federal lottery seem to have established themselves in the hall, but they are ordered to remove their equipment before the next meeting of the Board.

Unusual interest attaches to the use of the rooms for two courses of lectures given in the winters of 1786 and 1787 by Noah Webster, of spelling book and dictionary fame. He obtained permission for their use and gave a course of lectures on the English language in February 1786, which was attended by about a hundred persons and at which the pupils of Mr. Adgate's school sang as a chorus. March 15, 1786, he gave a lecture for the benefit of the Pennsylvania Hospital, the subject being "The connection between property and power . . . with remarks on slavery, climate, etc." He left to lecture at Yale in June 1786. He then had some correspondence with Franklin on spelling reform and on the possibility of obtaining permanent employment in Philadelphia; he returned there in 1787 and lectured at the University again in the autumn. He pleaded for the maintenance of American speech as against the ways of speaking of British play-actors.

He says he was asked by Provost Ewing to become Professor of Oratory at the University but did not want to tie himself down to teaching.

It must have been somewhat earlier that Lindley Murray, the grammarian, a predecessor of Webster in the study of language, was for a time a student in the English School under Kinnersley, and said long afterward that he always looked back with pleasure to his stay there and with regret that it had not been longer.¹

It might have been expected that these varied contacts and kindly services would have made so friendly an atmosphere around the University that it could have secured sufficient funds for its modest needs. Besides, one of the complaints made against the old College had been its insufficient endowment, and the legislators who had created the University had intended to provide adequately for its support. For that purpose the law of 1779 had guaranteed to it all the existing property of the College and had ordered that sufficient charges should be made against confiscated estates to give it an income from them not beyond £1,500 a year. But their needs were inadequately met by these provisions. Of the property the old Trustees handed on to the new but little was income-bearing, as indicated in the College accounts of 1779. The pledges given to the College in its pre-Revolutionary campaign for funds were disavowed or disregarded by those who had made them, notwithstanding the appeals of a specially appointed committee. The returns from the confiscated estates came in slowly. Within the first month the Trustees were forced to appeal to the Assembly for a loan of £15,000 currency, to be repaid when they should be able; when this was not immediately forthcoming and the treasury was actually empty, they ask, some months later, more modestly for £2,000 to meet the present emergency and to be repaid when their funds will permit. A depreciated currency made all expenses high, £22 for a new bell-rope in 1780, £90 for a lock and key for the University buildings in 1781. It had been necessary to double the salaries of the professors just at the close of the old administration, and with the additions to the Faculty the salary list now amounted to £3,000

¹ Elizabeth Frank, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Lindley Murray*, 2 ed. York, 1827, p. 24.

a year. Soon a committee was sent to the state Assembly to represent the embarrassed condition of the University.

In 1781 the Trustees were in such straits that they returned to a long-abandoned policy and asked the Assembly to authorize a lottery for £750; at another time they were so poor that they were glad to borrow £300 from the Vice-Provost. There was great difficulty in collecting students' fees and the rents from the confiscated Tory estates which were now coming into their hands as provided for by the law. The agent engaged to collect these sums had so much trouble that in 1783 he kept a woman in prison for debt until the Trustees intervened to secure her release. In 1785 the promised confiscated estates were finally enumerated and the titles vested in the University.¹ The dwelling houses that came to them in this way were in many cases in bad repair or subject to a ground rent that made them unprofitable as an investment. In such cases the property was sold. Much of the time of Trustees' meetings was for long periods devoted to discussion of the details of sales. Lots were thus sold to bring in an income of £1,300 in currency. The amounts realized seem in some cases to have been considerable, such as £1,050 for a lot on the corner of Race and Water streets. Doubtless there were substantial charges against these. It is hard to avoid a sigh of regret at these sales; much of the property in the heart of the city, Arch Street Wharf, for instance, or tracts in the outskirts, if they could have been held for later times, would have enriched the University by sums approaching the wealth of old landed corporations in European cities or Trinity Church, New York.

Nevertheless the budget was never balanced or running expenses paid. The salaries of the tutors especially seem to have been always in arrears; in their protests to the Trustees the gamut is run from pathetic appeals to threats of lawsuits. In 1787 they succeeded in obtaining a letter from Franklin urging that they be paid, the only communication he ever made to the Trustees. Instalments on professors' salaries were paid from time to time, but even they were never paid actually up to date.

One of the many committees which through the University's history have been instructed to devise a way to make its income

¹ *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania*, Chap. 1195, XII, 119-141.

correspond to its expenditures submitted an unusually full and discouragingly clear report in August 1788. It showed a net annual income of some £2,200 and an average expenditure after all economies of about £2,800, the regular annual deficit therefore being £600. Among the various proposed remedies for this condition of affairs it is notable that there is no question of seeking further support from the government of the state. It is evident that a change had taken place in the Board itself corresponding to the political transformation that was taking place in the state. The idea of the University as a state institution was becoming more tenuous, its ambitions less lofty. The committee can only suggest that the salaries of the professors should be further reduced, that the number of students should be increased by giving greater attention to the more popular branches and less to the fields taught by the higher professors. This defeatist report and its ready acceptance by the Trustees were without doubt influenced by the knowledge that legislation was imminent that would deprive them of the control of much of their property, reduce their prestige, and make their continued existence as a state university more than doubtful. To understand this change in the fortunes of the University it is necessary to go back for a moment to the law establishing it in 1779.

THE RESTORATION OF THE COLLEGE
1779-1789

Provost Smith and the Trustees of the College never accepted their disfranchisement by the Act of 1779 as just or even as legal. To them their expulsion from their trust seemed mere forcible seizure of their estates, rights, and powers by a legislative body in which their political opponents happened to be in a majority. Dr. Smith was unmeasured in his denunciation of the new Trustees. They were "robbers," they had got the institution into their hands by "robbing the Original Owners." With a curious confusion between trusteeship and ownership, the most influential of later interpreters of this series of events speaks of efforts "to restore the College estates to their rightful owners." Another critic describes the law of 1779 as "transferring the property of

one set of men to the pockets of another," and with an equally curious blindness to trusteeship and to due process of law speaks of the action of the Trustees of the state University "during their usurpation," asserting that "the money they were using did not belong to them in law or morals." It certainly did not, nor did it belong to their predecessors; they were both Trustees for its use; the Legislature had simply directed its use by one set of Trustees in place of another. This, however, was not acknowledged either by the ex-Provost or by the more aggressive members of the old Board for whom he spoke. He kept up a continual protest against the actions of the University. Among the most frequent entries in their minutes are communications from Dr. Smith. He was their *bête noire*. Some of these communications, it is true, concern his accounts, or the disputed return of the College keys, or of his dwelling house, but others impugn the legality of the actions of those to whom they are addressed or of their very existence as Trustees of the old endowments. His communications were regularly laid on the table.

He made similar protests to the state Legislature and appealed for their consideration of arguments against his removal and that of the other members of the Faculty. Such an appeal appeared in the session of 1780 and again in 1781; it was read again in March 1782 and this time referred to the Committee on Grievances, but received no further attention. This happened again in the fall session of 1782 and in December 1783. The ex-Provost's petition was regularly accompanied by a memorial to the same effect signed by several of the old Trustees, couched, it may be said, in more moderate terms. By 1782 the political complexion of the Assembly was evidently changing; the party which had created the constitution of 1776 and removed the Trustees of the old College was losing its hold. The usual petition and memorial were considered therefore somewhat more sympathetically in 1784; they were read a first and second time, but were ultimately buried as usual by reference to a committee.

By this time, however, a third body had come into existence with which a protest might be lodged, possibly with more hope of success. This was the Council of Censors, a body provided for in the state constitution of 1776. It was to meet every seven years,

to be elected by popular vote to act as a sort of periodic supreme court with power to declare unconstitutional laws recently passed, to recommend legislation and, if necessary, to call a convention for the adoption of a new constitution. It was a democratic provision peculiar to Pennsylvania and Vermont. A petition for attention to his grievance was promptly presented to them by Dr. Smith and a memorial submitted signed by such substantial members of the old Board of Trustees as Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, James Wilson, and Rev. William White. The Council of Censors, its membership completed in 1784 by the same voters as had elected the Assembly of that year, reflected the new conservative majority. Its committee on the constitutionality of legislation therefore expressed some doubt whether the law of 1779 by which the old Trustees and Faculty of the College had been removed was not "a deviation from the constitution."

Their report gave occasion for a long debate, in which the petition of Dr. Smith and the memorial of the Trustees were brought up and read; but the Council refused by a majority of thirteen to declare the act unconstitutional. The reasons for this decision and a minority report in favor of the College are spread in full on the record of the Council of Censors, from which this account is taken. The committee declared its belief "that the great majority of the late Trustees of the College of Philadelphia were not only hostile to our independency but abettors of the cause of the king of Great Britain and totally disqualified for such a trust under our present government. . . . To remedy these defects . . . legislative interposition became absolutely necessary." In other words, there had been, what was not always remembered, a Revolution, of which the ouster of the old Trustees had been a part. The minority reiterated the old charges. The "case of the College" had by this time become a *cause célèbre*; it was discussed in the newspapers and furnishes to modern students an excellent test of the alternating aristocratic and popular tendencies of the early days of the Republic. The old Board represented aristocracy and conservatism, the University the more revolutionary and democratic spirit.

Encouraged by this approximation to success and by the knowl-

edge that the opposite party was steadily losing ground, the old petitions were reintroduced in the next Assembly, and three solid weeks of legislative time were devoted to threshing over old straw. As a result a bill for the restoration of the rights petitioned for was introduced and passed its first reading; but the conservative trend in the Assembly was broken by a sudden defection of what was now a minority. September 28, 1784, nineteen radical members, on a preconcerted signal, rushed from the meeting room in the State House, leaving no quorum for the rest of the session. Conditions were thus left in a stalemate, the effects of which we have seen in a slowing up of the educational efforts of the University. Dr. Smith, though not giving up his home in Philadelphia, was residing in Chestertown, Maryland, where with his usual adaptability he had found and developed an old school, obtained for it from the Legislature of Maryland a college charter and named it Washington College. He found his principal interest in this, in ecclesiastical affairs, and, like so many others at that time, in speculation in western lands.

The restoration of the old College had, however, become a party policy, and when in 1788 the victory of the conservatives in the state Legislature had become complete, a committee again recommended Dr. Smith's petition and the memorial of the old Trustees to the serious and favorable attention of the Legislature. Dr. Smith also returned to the fray by publishing in that year *An Address to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania in the Case of the Violated Charter of the College*. The report of this committee was favorable to the old College but unfortunately was based almost entirely on the grounds of constitutionality. It claimed that the Legislature in 1779 had taken action contrary to the intent of those clauses in the state constitution of 1776 which protected existing corporations in their property rights and privileges. The desirability or undesirability of having a state university, the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of that which was then in existence, were not discussed; its personnel and work were not mentioned, nor were those of the College to which it was proposed to hand back its property and privileges. The question settled was one of personal and property rights, not one of educational policy.

There had never been any anticipation of a complete repeal of the Revolutionary statute of 1779. The bill the committee formulated, which was now passed by a large majority March 6, 1789,¹ did little more than repeal those parts of the act of ten years before that had deprived the Trustees and Faculty of the College of the control of the property they possessed at that time and of the exercise of the privileges granted to them under the original charters of 1753 and 1755. It was no more a regrant of the charters than the act of 1779 had been an abrogation of them. The charters had been in full vitality in the hands of the Trustees of the University; now the property and privileges under those charters of which the College Trustees and Faculty had been dispossessed were regranted to them. The line of continuity of chartered rights during this decade runs through the University, not through the group of dispossessed and protesting Trustees and Faculty. There never was a court decision on the question of constitutionality. The action of 1789, like that of 1779, was legislative, not judicial; they were no less authoritative on that account, perhaps more so.

Dr. Smith, in classic phrase and with characteristic use of an English example, proposed that the inscription that was set on Queen's College, Oxford, at the Restoration, should be placed on the College building. Without burdening this text with the Latin, in translation it would read, "By the divine mercy and care this College, rescued as it were from a Babylonian captivity, is restored to its proper and legitimate Trustees." This legend, like another famous inscription prepared for a modern restored university, that of Louvain, was never placed upon it. The College had more immediate needs and tasks.

THE TWO INSTITUTIONS
1789-1791

The restoration of 1789 was a handsome victory for Dr. Smith and the old Board of Trustees, and the wrath of the colonial College came back again to Fourth and Arch streets. Dr. Smith of course again became, or, as he would have put it, was again

¹ *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania*, Chap. 1393, XIII, 191-92.

acknowledged as Provost. Ewing moved out of the Provost's House that had now become almost an emblem of control, and Dr. Smith moved in. The vacancies that the Tory defections and the hand of death had caused in the Board of Trustees were filled by the election of ten new members. Of these, four were members of the Assembly prominent in obtaining the restoration of its estates and privileges to the College, two were graduates, all were wealthy and prominent citizens, and most of them had taken an active though a late-chosen part in the Revolution. In consideration of the weak health of Franklin the Trustees met regularly for some weeks at his home and he was chosen to his old position of President of the Board at their organization meeting, March 9, 1789.¹

Provost Smith taught the same subjects as before; James Davidson, the only other surviving member of the old Faculty, returned to his professorship of the classics. Rev. John Andrews, a graduate of the class of 1765 who had been Principal of the newly established Episcopal Academy in Philadelphia, was elected Professor of Moral Philosophy and Vice-Provost, and was given a portion of the old dormitory building for a dwelling.

Thus the College returned to its old quarters and undertook its old work. A newspaper notice of April 15, 1789, six weeks after the passage of the repeal law, announces that "the several schools of this seminary are now opened upon their ancient foundation."

It is one of the anomalies of the time and the situation that, although the College was re-established upon its "ancient foundation," the University still continued to exist, based upon the same foundation, if by that foundation is understood the charters of 1753 and 1755. The modern lawyer finds it hard to conceive of two corporations drawing their powers from the same incorporating charter, and the question naturally arises what right the University had to continue to function after the repeal act of 1789. Yet there is no doubt that it did so act and almost without change or question. The Trustees of the University continued to meet, the professors to teach, students to gather and recite; fees con-

¹ He is called in the minutes "the Venerable Dr. Benjamin Franklin, the Father and one of the first Founders of the Institution."

tinued to be received, land to be conveyed, degrees to be conferred by them. There were two institutions, the University and the College, where there had been one before. The act of 1789, which had restored the old Board, the Willings and Hopkinson, the Shippens and Cadwaladers, the newly elected members, and Dr. Smith to their rights and privileges was not considered to have deprived the new Board, the state officers, city clergymen, and "eminent citizens" of theirs. Only Dr. Smith, the implacable, in guarded terms in an undated letter, preserved among the University archives, suggests to his correspondent a list of possible imperfections in the claim of the University to continue to exist. But neither these questions nor any of similar import were openly asked at the time.

The explanation is doubtless to be found in the nature of the repeal act of 1789. It must be explained as having returned to the old Trustees and Faculty all they had control of when the "confirming" act of 1779 was passed, to have reinstated them in the position, powers, and property they had possessed at that time, but not to have divested the University of the rights which had been then accorded it or of the property it had subsequently acquired. The very advocates of restoration of its power to the old College contemplated the continuance of the new University. Whatever was true *de jure*, the University continued to exist *de facto*. It is necessary therefore to bear in mind that for a time, fortunately for a short time, a bare two years, from 1789 to 1791, there were two institutions, with the same origin, traditions, and objects, and to tell the history concurrently of both as best we may.

Since the College resumed possession of the Fourth and Arch Street building the University had to seek a new abode. They found momentarily a gathering place in "the Lodge in Lodge Alley," a building put up by the Masons twenty years before for their own uses, for a dance hall for the Assembly, and for such purposes. But the University soon secured more suitable quarters in the building being erected by the Philosophical Society on land given them by the state on what is now known as Independence Square, on Fifth Street just below Chestnut. The Philosophical Society, which had held its meetings in the hall of the University

in 1782 and 1783, now reciprocated by entering into an agreement by which the University should pay £85 a year rent for five years for the use of the building, repairing and completing it, receiving, however, credit for the expense of doing so, and leaving to the Society the use of the two southern rooms and the basement, which, it may be said parenthetically, are still in active and learned use by the Philosophical Society today. By vote of the Legislature they were allowed to use the State House bell when the Assembly was not in session, and at six, seven, eight, twelve, one, and five o'clock every day instead of ringing out liberty to all, it is to be feared it announced at least a temporary imprisonment to a few score reluctant scholars.

On June 20, 1789, the newspapers advertised "The trustees of the University having fitted up the rooms of the Philosophical Hall on Fifth Street, on the State House Square, for the accommodation of the several schools, the business of that Institution will be hereafter carried on at that place, and the Students are desired to attend their respective Professors and Tutors on Monday next at eight o'clock in the morning." The German School was set at six o'clock in the morning; and extra "schools" in mathematics and English were opened from six till nine in the evening.

For a while the two streams ran parallel, in friendly rivalry. Both tried to separate the upper classes, the College and the University proper, from the lower classes, the Academic departments, to which they were so closely bound. The University Trustees had at one time ordered that no professor in the philosophical classes should give any instruction in the lower schools, but the adoption of the four-group system immediately afterward blurred the outlines of this distinction, and the lower and upper schools in the University still were intermingled. The College likewise tried, though with scarcely greater success, to make a clearer discrimination between Academy and College. Its Trustees passed a rule similar to that of the University forbidding any professor to teach both Academy and College classes, but could not enforce it; the disentanglement proved a long and difficult operation and was not completed till 1825.

A proposal was now made to unite the Latin School still more

closely to the College and at the same time to give greater separateness to the English and Mathematical schools by giving them, in combination, the name of Academy and putting them under the separate control of a teacher of English and oratory. This subordination of the English School was distasteful to Franklin, the old advocate of a purely English college course, and although he was a member of two successive committees on the question which did nothing, in June 1789 he drew up a long and severe indictment of his colleagues past and present, which he headed *Observations Relating to the Intentions of the Original Founders of the Academy in Philadelphia*. In this he claimed that the subscriptions which he himself had solicited in 1749 had been "more liberal as well as more general" because of the expectation of most of the subscribers that the institution would be devoted principally to the carrying on of English studies. Instead of that the classical elements had been pampered, the English starved. He charged the poor success of the English School to the Trustees' "niggardly neglect of good masters," so that these were driven out of the school, their pupils following them. The numerous and good private schools at this time in the city were the product, he declares, of the poor management of the Trustees. The public were dissatisfied with the equipment and services provided in the field of English studies and the preference shown to the classics. He closed by suggesting that the English School be separated completely from the College and Latin School, with an equitable division of their joint stock. "We wish," he says, "to execute the plan they [the Trustees] have so long defeated and afford the public the means of a complete English education." This was with one exception his last literary composition. It closes with a pathetic paragraph:

I am the only one of the original trustees now living, and I am just stepping into the grave myself.—I seize this opportunity, the last I may possibly have, of bearing testimony against these deviations. I seem here to be surrounded by the ghosts of my dear departed friends, beckoning and urging me to use the only tongue now left us in demanding that justice to our grandchildren that to our children has been denied; and I hope they will not be sent away discontented.

It does not appear to whom Franklin refers as "we," though there is known to have been a dissatisfied group among the Trustees; nor indeed did this protest and appeal ever reach his colleagues. He sent it for consideration and advice to his friend Robert Hare, who had just been elected a Trustee and was also a member of the committee on the English School. Hare acknowledged it in a letter dated July 14, 1789, expressing his entire agreement with Franklin's strictures and judgments, but urging him not to attempt to make the separation he proposed. The attempt at this time would certainly fail; the prejudices of some of the Trustees, the opposition of Provost Smith, "his active, indefatigable character when engaged in measures on which he is intent," and the efforts against it of friends of the other professors would make an overwhelming opposition. He urges Franklin, however, first omitting the proposal for a separation, to print in a pamphlet his criticisms and demands for more attention to English subjects, and thus appeal from the Trustees to public opinion. Hare would have him hold his proposal over the Board *in terrorem*, not only at present but for the future; his pamphlets had always exercised great influence.

Before the aged statesman had answered this letter or asked for the return of the manuscript he had indeed "stepped into the grave," and Hare eventually returned the paper to the author's executors with the statement that he had shown it to no one.¹ Although the English School was much discussed and successive committees were appointed to report upon it, no essential changes were made and the influences that controlled the College and its adjuncts still remained mainly classical.

April 1790 the Provosts, Vice-Provosts, and Trustees of both the College and the University, along with the Trustees of the Hospital and the Library, the Philosophical Society, the Cincinnati, and similar bodies, in a great procession of corporations, political organizations, clergymen, and distinguished citizens, followed the body of Franklin to his simple grave, not a stone's throw from the buildings occupied in turn by College and Uni-

¹ Smyth, *op. cit.*, X, 9-31, and footnote; *Letters to Franklin*, Amer. Philosophical Society, XXXVI, ii, 153.

versity, with the early days of which he had been so closely connected.

Both institutions drew up formal statements of their requirements for degrees in medicine, the only educational demand of the time that, in Philadelphia at least, was sufficiently pressing to justify serious attention. These rules were practically identical; those of the University, which had been drawn up in 1788, were now adopted on July 7, 1790. They had been under consideration during the whole preceding decade; they required three years of study, at least two of them in the University, three examinations, successively before the medical professors, the Trustees, and the public, the preparation and publication of a thesis. A candidate must be twenty-one years of age. These requirements were for the Bachelor of Medicine; for the Doctor of Medicine there were the same additional requirements as before. The requirements of the College, although they scarcely differed from these, and were also published in 1790, became basic for later times, for with some modifications they became the requirements for the degree of M.D., the only medical degree which was to be given in America after 1791.

On the reëstablishment of the College three of the original four medical professors, Drs. Shippen, Kuhn, and Rush, had been invited to resume their old positions and had accepted; Dr. Morgan, still sulking in his tent, his wife dead, his own health impaired, his reputation half-forgotten and his fortune gone, although offered the opportunity to resume his place, made no reply, and October 15, 1789, he died. Dr. Rush was promoted to the chair of the practice of medicine and a week later, October 29, Dr. Caspar Wistar began his long and influential career. When Dr. Kuhn resigned, Dr. Griffiths was elected in his place. The reorganization of the group, abandonment of the preliminary degree of Bachelor of Medicine, and the establishment of new but scarcely changed rules for the grant of the traditional M.D. were, presumably, the work of Dr. Shippen. The lower degree was given up on the ground that young men, on the basis of holding it and of the knowledge that they had taken medical courses, would undertake regular practice too easily and while still inexperienced, and so reflect discredit on the College. The

new rules adopted March 17, 1789, which led to the degree of M.D., made no requirement of preparation for entering upon them beyond that of having attained the age of twenty-one. They demanded either two or three years of study, attendance on each of the courses of lectures offered in the Medical School, the usual series of three examinations and the writing, either in English or Latin, of a thesis, which must be successfully defended before the medical professors, and then published at the student's expense. There was to be a separate medical Commencement each year. At that held by the College in June 1790, however, the fourteen students who were graduated received only the bachelor's degree, the new requirements not yet having come into force.

A month later occurred the only Commencement for Arts students held by the restored College; at this seven students, who had received most of their instruction in the University but had subsequently enrolled in the College, were given their A.B.

The most distinctive achievement of the restored College during its brief life as a separate institution was the establishment of what was expected to be an annual series of law lectures. Philadelphia lawyers were already as famous as Philadelphia doctors, but as yet there were no regular courses in law similar to those in medicine. Lawyers still learned their profession, as physicians had formerly done, by work in a practitioner's office. Law students themselves, however, had already taken steps for mutual instruction. It will be remembered that in September of the year 1787 a petition from a "Junior Law Society" for the use of one of their rooms was presented to the Trustees of the University. Immediately on the reorganization of the College, in March 1789, a petition for the use of one of the rooms was presented by "a number of young gentlemen students in law," presumably the same organization. It was declared in one of the newspapers in 1790 that a law professorship had long been wanted. Such a proposal was evidently ripe for consideration. It was given definiteness by a recommendation presented to the Board of Trustees July 18, 1790, by Charles Smith, Esq., son of the Provost. He had graduated under his father at Washington College in 1783, during the interregnum, had studied law with an older brother,

and been admitted to the bar in Philadelphia, in 1786. Like his brothers and many young lawyers of the time, he had established himself in one of the county towns of the state, Sunbury, and had a good practice. At this time he was in Philadelphia as a delegate to the convention then framing the new constitution for the state adopted in that year. He was twenty-five years of age. In his memorial to the Trustees he points out the desirability of establishing a law lectureship in the College and offers himself to deliver such a course each winter. He would like to open the course the next winter under their auspices "as he has been encouraged to expect a considerable number of pupils"—or will begin it at his own risk, as a candidate for a future professorship.

The proposal gave rise to much discussion, and the suggestion of the grant of degrees in law was added to it. Finally in August a committee of the Trustees made a long and favorable report on the project; a resolution provided for the delivery of a course of at least twenty-four lectures each winter, and a prescription was made for the content of the course. Although the course was to include the canon law, civil law, maritime law, and the law merchant, it was really, as described, to be rather a course in political science and constitutional history than in either law or procedure. Having approved the scheme the Trustees proceeded to elect to the professorship not Mr. Smith, who must have been bitterly disappointed, but a much more eminent man, one of their own number, James Wilson. Fresh from his great services in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and his many other forms of distinction culminating in his recent appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States, his willingness to become the first Professor of Law in the College, and indeed in the United States, was a matter of public satisfaction and congratulation. He resigned of course from the Board of Trustees. He was to be paid by the fees of his students, which he was himself to set, up to a limit of ten guineas—a sum which if actually charged must have excluded many young members of the Junior Law Society. But the course was conceived of as intended not so much for young law students as for "gentlemen of all professions, but especially legislators, magistrates, and other lawyers."

The introductory lecture of the course was given in the old hall of the College at six o'clock in the evening of December 15, 1790. No speaker could have wished a more distinguished audience. It included President and Mrs. Washington, Vice-President John Adams, members of both houses of Congress, the President and both houses of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, ladies and gentlemen, making, according to the newspaper account, "a most brilliant and respectable audience." The address was worthy of the occasion, learned and eloquent, and not too long. It was later published, along with the rest of the course of lectures that followed it in the ensuing weeks. A second course was begun in the fall of 1791 but not long continued. Judge Wilson's other occupations may have interfered—the reasons do not appear—but although he retained the title, and a School of Law was still for some years advertised as part of the University, there was not for many years any resumption of its life. In the meantime, however, in the new interest in law as an academic subject, the Trustees at the medical Commencement of December 1790, held in College Hall, conferred an honorary degree in law on Judges Wilson, Shippen, and Hopkinson.

A brave attempt was made by the University to carry on in its rooms in the American Philosophical Society's building. Commencements were held in 1789 and 1790 in the new German Lutheran church on Fourth Street in the square above the old College buildings. In the first of those years there were nine who took their degree of A.B., and eight of M.A. For the first time the degree of M.D. was given to twelve graduates of the medical courses, not, it is true, according to the new requirements adopted by the College, but to men who had previously taken degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and now came up for the Doctor's degree.

For the third time Washington appears on the University scene. In April 1789, when he arrived in Philadelphia to take up his duties as President, its Trustees met and proceeded to the City Tavern at Second and Chestnut streets—no long journey from the Philosophical Society building on Fifth Street—where they presented an address describing him as holding the "first office in the Federal Empire"; to which "His Excellencie" was

pleased to give, as usual, an excellent reply. It was unfortunate for the Trustees of the College that all this official recognition of the great ones of the new nation was by the University, not by them. It must have seemed to them especially unfortunate that they must hear of the congratulations offered by the University December 30, 1790, to General Mifflin on his becoming Governor of Pennsylvania under the newly adopted constitution of the state; for he was one of their own men, a graduate of the class of 1760, a Trustee under the old dispensation and the new, participant in almost every activity of the College, the University, the state, and the nation for a whole generation. The University in its address described itself, as the College could not have done, as "an institution which owes its existence to the legislature of the state," and, what must have expressed either a desperate hope or a prophecy, "still relies on it for further support and encouragement." It insists that "while every private seminary of learning within the state will undoubtedly experience your protection, the University of Pennsylvania will enjoy a special care and protection." The reply of the Governor was sympathetic and judicious.

But all this must have been whistling to keep up their spirits, for already the Trustees had accepted and spread on their minutes their swan song in a report on their finances, their equipment, their achievements, and their teaching. A committee had been at work on this for more than a year with the help of a paid accountant for its financial statement. It was finally presented to the Assembly by the committee members in person in April 1791. It set forth that only three-fourths of the provision of £1,500 of yearly income from forfeited estates, promised on the formation of the University, had ever been paid; that they had been forced by the legislation of 1789 to turn over to the restored College, under specially unfavorable conditions, the original equipment and endowment of that body; and that they were consequently burdened with debts. They had nevertheless in the preceding twelve years annually carried through to graduation some ten to twenty men in arts and five to ten in medicine. Although the numbers of pupils in the lower schools had fallen off since the restoration of the old College in 1789, those in the

collegiate department had held their own or risen. They were daring enough to inform the Legislature that to do their work properly they needed two additional professors and several more tutors. A thousand pounds were needed for equipment of the laboratory and additions to the library.

This report was an *apologia* or a defense rather than a serious proposal, for long before it had been presented the University had voted for the abandonment of its separate existence altogether. It is a matter of interest, however, that the period in which Pennsylvania was a state university closed with no more discredit than was due to its restricted means and to the decay of the political party to which it owed its existence.

The finances of the College were in an equally bad condition. On its reestablishment in 1789 it had of course demanded back and received the buildings and securities it had possessed in 1779, but these were no more sufficient for its needs than they had been when they were lost to it. They asked John Penn to permit the sale of the Perkasie lands, and put the Norristown estate up for sale, and some of each of these were disposed of, but the College, like the University, looked to the state government for aid. In February 1790 the Trustees appointed two committees, one to solicit private subscriptions for a three-year period, the other to draw up an address to the Legislature describing their plight and asking for state assistance. While awaiting some return from these they authorized the treasurer to borrow £3,000 for immediate needs.

Scholastic conditions were scarcely more satisfactory. A committee reports that most of the Latin books the students use have English translations, which may be good for beginners, but "enable older scholars to deceive their masters"; there is great want of order and decorum; composition and oratory are little attended to; and geography, chronology, and history are not taught at all. The pupils pass from the Academy to the College at too early an age, and classes are dismissed at half past four whereas the rules require them to continue till five. The numbers at the Board meetings are small, seldom more than twelve of the twenty-four members attending—sometimes only three or four. In July 1791 a committee is ordered to report whether any professors

can be dismissed so as to reduce expenses to meet income and to pay the arrears due to those who remain.

By the beginning of 1791 both groups of Trustees were ready to consider a combination. Its desirability, indeed its necessity, is obvious to the modern student. The existence of each of the two had been a difficult struggle, and although one academic institution in Philadelphia might in the future receive the state subsidies each felt to be requisite, certainly two could not. Nor could private support be relied on. Philadelphia was not essentially a college-going community. It was rich, commercial, ingenious, scientific, tolerant; it had produced its quota, perhaps more than its quota of able and even learned men; it had a certain appreciation of music, of art, of the drama. But it was not intellectual; it did not love or appreciate knowledge or things of the mind for their own sake. It seemed, it still seems to its critics, material in its interests. But one collegiate institution, and that with all the resources and prestige it could command, could at that time be supported in Philadelphia.

Unfortunately there was no educational leadership in sight to decide what shape this should take. Franklin was no more, Dr. Smith belonged to a past era, and was, besides, the center of too much conflict to play again his old rôle. Dr. Ewing was a follower, though a protesting one, not a leader in educational matters. University and College alike, whether separate or combined, must be dependent on the wisdom of a group of business and professional men, neither trained, nor, it is to be feared, very seriously interested in education as such. They had, however, wisely determined on union.

THE UNION

1791

The difficulty of deciding who first began any negotiation, friendly or hostile, is a familiar one. With a natural jealousy each institution now took pains to credit the other with the initiation of the plan for a union, because for each it meant a surrender. So far as the actual records go, it was the College that took the first step. On January 14, 1791, a resolution was passed

by the Board of Trustees of the College instructing their President to write to the University Trustees that they understood the University was contemplating appointing a committee to bring up the question of a union of the two institutions, and that the College would be responsive to such a suggestion. When this advance reached the University Board, February 9, 1791, they declared that they had not had the matter under consideration but were quite willing to discuss it with the College Trustees. Conferences were held during the succeeding summer. At these conferences held in the State House, which was considered neutral ground, during August and September, they played with a number of questions. The possible abandonment of the old title "Provost" is suggested by the use of the expression, "the principal officer of the University by whatever name he be called." The College, notwithstanding its tradition of private foundation, suggests that a union might make both institutions "more objects of legislative protection and encouragement." The Trustees of the College are willing "to surrender up their charters into the hands of the Legislature," but stipulate, of all things, the preservation of their Charity School. This may have had some obscure relation to their retention of their original home, so closely connected with the trust for that school. The College, moreover, was willing to concede the use of the name "University" but tried to retain the "Philadelphia." But the larger implications of the state title could not be abandoned by the Trustees of the University, though the permanent location in the city was agreed to by both.

By September, terms of union had been agreed upon that both College and University were ready to place before the Legislature, to be made the legal basis of the single institution that was to be the successor of both. Its main provisions were simple. The expression the "University of Pennsylvania" had become so familiar, with the omission of the words "the State of," that its formal adoption was merely a mild concession by the College to its rival. The word "University" was, as it had long been, obviously suitable for an institution with both college and medical courses, and all the more so now that it professed to have a law course. The term was fast coming into general use through-

out the country even where it was not properly applicable. Three of the new states at the time of the Revolution provided in their constitution for universities at the head of their systems of education.

That somewhat grandiose term probably represented rather the exuberant attitude of the time than any specific claim or description. The Massachusetts Constitutional Convention refers repeatedly in 1779 and 1780 to Harvard as "the University at Cambridge," although Harvard College itself did not use the term till long afterward. The Chevalier de Chastellux who, as before stated, traveled in the United States in 1781 and 1782, called Princeton, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and William and Mary indiscriminately colleges and universities. Indeed President Witherspoon of Princeton took pains to explain to him that his was a genuine university, though it does not appear on what ground, as it had only the collegiate department.

The new Board of Trustees was to have the same number of members as each of the old boards. Twelve were to be elected by each. The new Board was to be self-perpetuating, without the *ex officio* or clerical elements of the old University Board. It retained only two traces of connection with the state government; the Governor of the state should always be President of the Board of Trustees, and the University was bound to lay a statement of its financial condition every year before the Legislature, which was believed by those who drew up the act of union to imply a promise of state financial support. Careful provisions were inserted to prevent partisanship in the election of Trustees and professors and precipitancy in the expulsion of the latter. The property of both institutions was to be turned over to the new body.

These arrangements were drawn up in the form of a statute, dated September 13, 1791, and adopted by the first Legislature elected under the new state constitution. By this act the agreement between the two Boards of Trustees was made statutory and the University was freshly incorporated, with all the usual rights of a corporation. The act of union and incorporation of 1791 comes nearer to bringing about the establishment of a new institution than does any other change in its history. But

neither this nor any other action, historically considered, has broken the line of continuity from the charters of 1753 and 1755 on which the powers of the University as an educational institution are based. There had been no time, except during the confusions of the Revolution, when it had not been engaged in administering property, giving instruction, carrying on examinations, and granting degrees.

The Trustees of the College elected from among themselves twelve members of the new Board in October, the Trustees of the University chose theirs in November. These twenty-four gentlemen were provided by their respective Boards with certificates of election, and were called together November 8, 1791, by Governor Mifflin in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth in the State House. Here the law under which they were to act and their certificates of election were read aloud, and the Governor then declared that they "shall be and they are hereby made and instituted a corporation and body politic in law and in fact, to have continuance forever by the aforesaid name, style and title of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania."

There appear from time to time in the formal and colorless minutes of the Board of Trustees that have furnished so much of the material for this story, the vague outlines of a picture that might, if skilfully filled in, go far to give the narrative a life to which the written word is inadequate. One such scene would be the gathering in Roberts' Coffee House in February 1750, where the plain and pious Trustees of the New Building and the Charity School transferred these trusts to Logan, Franklin, and the twenty-two other representatives of wealthy and substantial Philadelphia. Another would be the procession in state of the Trustees and Faculty to the residence of Governor Morris in 1755, there to take the oaths of allegiance and succession and to make the declaration against transubstantiation required in the new charter that would enable them to hold their positions, and grant their degrees. Still another would be the scene of December 1779, when the President and Vice-President of the Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania, the Attorney-General, the Treasurer and the Secretary, the Chief Justice and other state officials, the leading clergymen and appointed citizens met in

the old College hall to establish the first university under that name in the United States and to take their oaths of fidelity to a sovereign power less personal but not less authoritative than the King who ruled in 1755. Now it is another group of Trustees, meeting in the grave solemnity of Independence Hall under the presidency of the Governor, in November 1791, who present a scene no less picturesque than any of its predecessors though no oaths were taken and plainer costume was the order of the day.

The names of the twenty-four Trustees who now proceeded along with the Governor to organize themselves into the permanent Board of Trustees are, many of them, already familiar, others will be mentioned later. A writer far more conversant with the lines of social distinction in Philadelphia than this author can claim to be declares that the two strains, that of the old aristocracy and Anglicanism, represented in the Trustees elected by the College, and that of the new men and Presbyterianism, brought in by the University, can be clearly distinguished, and that unity in such a board was impossible.¹ If this were true, so much the worse, for only in unity and some degree of responsiveness to the demands of the community was there any hope of solid achievement. The day had gone by, if it had ever existed, when a successful college or university in this city of different creeds and diversified interests could be built on the predominance of any one of them.

The union could not be considered complete until the Faculty as well as the body of Trustees had been reconstituted. This was accomplished in the early months of 1792. The work of the medical professors was most pressing. They had in fact already begun their winter courses in both the schools. Since one of them, Dr. Shippen, was already included in both Faculties, it was found possible to constitute a single Faculty by electing all the other professors from both to the new one. This gave a medical Faculty of seven men, with the familiar names of Shippen, Wistar, Kuhn, Rush, Hutchinson, Griffitts, and Barton. The union of the two medical schools was a success from the beginning. The medical

¹ H. W. Smith, *Life and Correspondence of the Rev. William Smith*, Phila., 1880, II, 315.

department had the inestimable advantage of knowing its objective—to produce physicians.

The union of the two Faculties in Arts presented greater difficulties. The salaries of the medical professors were drawn directly from the fees of their students; those of the professors in the College proper must be drawn from the College treasury. This made the size of the Faculty a matter of much question, of frequent committee reports and endless debates. Finally a Faculty of six, the same number and much the same composition as that of the old College, was decided upon. Both of the old Faculties had been recently so depleted that it proved possible to elect all their members but two. The difficulty was somewhat reduced by a letter from Vice-Provost Magaw, of the University, asking the Trustees that he be not placed on the new Faculty since it would preclude the appointment of his special friend, Dr. Andrews, Vice-Provost of the College; at the same time he expressed the hope that he might be appointed later to some teaching position.

The greatest difficulty was the decision what to do about Provost Smith. His election would necessitate dropping one or other of the older professors, each of whom had his friends. There was, besides, strong opposition to him from some of the Trustees. He found it hard to believe that he might actually be left out of the new institution, impossible to reconcile himself to it. Indeed it long seemed uncertain whether this would be. He could teach many subjects; it was not till late in April 1792 that in a vote for Professor of Greek and Latin Dr. Smith was defeated by Dr. Davidson, the old incumbent, in a vote of thirteen to eleven. His expostulations and bitter protests at this exclusion, in long letters spread on the Trustees' minutes or filed in the University archives gradually declined into appeals for the settlement of his accounts, concerning which there was considerable difference of opinion. These were, however, finally settled on what he must have considered satisfactory terms, for he and the four members of the committee signed them formally on April 21, 1795. He was paid £900 outright in satisfaction of all old claims; the yearly pension of £100 in the restored currency for the remainder of

his life, the reward of his old efforts in England; and he was confirmed in the occupancy of the Provost's House rent free for another year. No student of the career of the old Provost can fail to read with regret this contentious and somewhat humiliating record of his later life. He was, however, not in straitened circumstances; his investments in land had apparently turned out well, and he left successful and even distinguished descendants. The membership of the Faculty having been determined, Dr. Ewing, who had been Provost of the old University, was now elected Provost of the combined institution and Dr. Andrews, who had been Vice-Provost of the College, was elected to the same position in the University.

The Faculty had taken for granted that they would draw up the scheme of studies and promptly held a meeting and formulated a plan not differing materially from that previously in use, which was practically the old curriculum of Dr. Smith of 1754. They were surprised to learn that the Trustees intended to draw up the plan of instruction. This was sent to the Faculty in April 1792. It was a curious arrangement, the result of a number of committee reports, discussions, amendments, and compromises on the part of such Trustees as took an interest in the subject. It had no basis except a mixture of tradition and experiment. Each of the familiar fields, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, the classics, mathematics, English, and "German and Oriental Languages" was assigned to one of the six professors. These traditional terms were made to include a great number and variety of subjects, distributed among the professors with little reference to their knowledge or interest. Dr. Ewing, the Professor of Natural Philosophy, which corresponds to modern physics, was to teach also natural history, chemistry, and agriculture, with "so much of astronomy as applies to navigation and geography," along with the laws of matter and motion, mechanics and projectiles, and their application to gunnery and fortification, electricity, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, and optics.

The Professor of Moral Philosophy must also teach rhetoric, composition, "and such parts of natural philosophy as the professor of that branch shall not be able to manage." The other professors, in addition to teaching the subjects from which their

professorships were named and other matters more or less germane to them, were each given charge of one of the lower schools: the classical professor, of the Latin School; the professor of belles lettres, of the English School. The latter must teach also not only rhetoric but logic and metaphysics to the older boys, including history and geography. The professor of mathematics must teach history and geography to the younger boys along with arithmetic, bookkeeping, and practical mathematics. Minute arrangements were made for methods of teaching, hours, keeping of rolls, and similar matters.

Dr. Ewing, acknowledging his election as Provost and speaking for the Faculty, assented to these arrangements for teaching, though insisting that the plan the Faculty had drawn up was much better, having been the result of long experience and "more for the reputation of the Institution and the Benefit of the Students." This conflict of jurisdiction and difference between Trustees and Faculty as to what the curriculum should be remained a long and sometimes an embittered dispute.

SMITH AND FRANKLIN

Before passing on to a period in which the men who had played their parts in early times were to be so largely forgotten, it may be well to stop for a moment to consider the personalities of the two most eminent of them, and to estimate the influence of each. Except for the stubborn persistence of the ideas of Franklin the colonial College was what Provost William Smith made it. The Trustees seem to have been willing generally to accept his educational ideas and to have given him much freedom of action inside and outside the College. It was his tireless industry and activity of mind that gave him his influence. This made him a participant in every movement of the time and a speaker on every subject. He was alert-minded, versatile, indefatigable, eloquent; but his reasoning was not profound, and his arguments were not persuasive.

His acquaintance in Philadelphia and in Great Britain was wide; in addition to being "The Provost" he was a member of the Masons, of the Philosophical Society, of the Hand in Hand

Fire Company and of the vestry of Christ Church, all significant social connections in Philadelphia. He was an unwearied traveler, and in his repeated trips abroad made acquaintances that extended from the King, the archbishops and bishops, and the Penn family to a considerable number of his Scotch fellow countrymen. He was a ready writer but had no great body of knowledge to draw on. He had great power of formulating the familiar and the commonplace but little originality. His gifts for leadership were mediocre; he had no capacity for coöperation or ability to understand the views of other men.

He never really led a party, much less dominated one. His connection with the Penn family and his own predilection made him an advocate of the interests of the Proprietary party, but he was not its leader. He was a natural orator with a copious flow of words and readiness of allusion, and was much in demand for sermons on special occasions. He was admired but, outside of his family, neither loved nor trusted, and he had few, if any, intimate friends. With the Revolution his political and academic influence ceased. His hesitant attitude toward independence, though comprehensible and perhaps justifiable, cut him off from any political activity in the period immediately after the war, and he did not, like many others, seek a useful place under the new conditions. Instead, he speculated in western lands. However indispensable he had been to the colonial College, the two years of his second provostship were quite futile. He had none of the essential greatness of Franklin.

Franklin, on the other hand, was a great man by the gift of nature. His pervasive influence on almost all aspects of his time is unquestionable. It is our part to estimate only his influence on the College and the University. It is not easy to measure. A great man is not only superior in ability to the men around him, he is unique among them. Greatness is not just a matter of degree; it is a difference in kind. His influence must therefore be measured by its quality, not its quantity. No student of the history of the College and the University of Pennsylvania can fail to be impressed with the significance of Franklin in that history. But how shall it be measured? Not by the length of the period

in which that influence was effective; it was restricted to a period of seven years.

With the events of 1740 he had nothing to do; his plans of 1743 were stillborn. His connection began in 1749. He himself indicates its practical close in the letter written from London July 28, 1759, to his friend and colleague Professor Kinnersley, part of which has been already quoted. In this he remarks:

Before I left Philadelphia everything to be done in the Academy was privately preconcerted in a cabal, without my knowledge or participation, and accordingly carried into execution.

He had accordingly resigned the presidency of the Board of Trustees in 1756, and left for England on his mission for the Provincial Assembly in April 1757. He was after that date almost constantly abroad. In few letters addressed to him during that period was mention made of the College, and in still fewer does he ask about it.

Although named a member of the reconstructed Board of Trustees in 1779, he never took his seat in that body and communicated with it only twice. The meetings of the old Board after its reincarnation in 1789 were, it is true, held for a few weeks in his house, because of his extreme age and ill health, and under his presidency, but the only record of his activity during that year was the rather bitter protest against the policy of his colleagues, and the next year he died. For his active participation in the affairs of the College, we are therefore restricted to the short period from 1749 to 1756.

His financial contributions were small. After his first campaign to secure subscriptions, among which his own appears about midway between the largest and the smallest, and his successful appeal for a subsidy from the Philadelphia City Council, he neither gave to it from his own means or interested himself in securing support for it. He had no such claim to its gratitude for his financial efforts as Provost Smith obtained by his successful begging tours in England and the Carolinas. It was thought that he might have induced the provincial Assembly to appropriate money for the College in 1756, just as he had se-

cured from it a grant for the Hospital in 1752, but by that time parties had divided and the majority in the Legislature were in opposition to the College.

Nor was his influence over the choice of studies of its students predominant, as the analysis of its curriculum indicates. A scheme of studies that devoted two-thirds of the student's time in his preparatory school and more than one-third of it in the College to the Greek and Latin classics cannot be considered to represent the educational ideals of one who was never weary of advocating the advantages of a purely English education, and wanted the style of students to be modeled on the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, Pope, and Addison. Franklin's own educational ideas are hard to discriminate from his concessions to "men of influence," but in any case, we know that scholasticism was much more prominent in the course than he would have liked, and the drill in the use of English which he desired was subordinated to extended study of the classics.

It is the same with religion. Neither the cool deism of Franklin nor the fervor of the Whitefield Trustees characterized the religious life of the College. Most of its functions were carried on in the framework of Anglicanism. Prayers were read at the opening and closing of the day's exercises, students learned the Church catechism; Commencements and other ceremonial occasions were usually opened with the Episcopal church service, read by Dr. Smith or Mr. Peters. He made no protest against these practices, but they certainly did not reflect his religious ideals.

How then shall the unquestioned influence of Franklin on this institution be estimated? If he did not dominate it through a long period of minute control as did Provost Smith, nor give or obtain for it any large endowment, or define its curriculum or its religion, to what is due that recognition of the impress of his hand upon it which every student of its history shares? The question may be answered partly in his own words: he had given it "the full advantage of my head, hands, heart and purse in getting through the first difficulties of the design."

His first contribution was his origination of the idea of a college in Philadelphia: he complained that there was "no militia,

no college." Of all the inchoate educational suggestions of the middle years of the eighteenth century it was Franklin's plan, drawn up in 1743 and renewed in the *Proposals* of 1749, that formulated the idea of a college. Second was his diligence in the service of the Academy and College. There is no reason to doubt the substantial correctness of the account he gives in his *Autobiography* of the events of the years 1749-50. He conversed with leading men on the project of an Academy and College, he composed, with some advice, printed and distributed the *Proposals*; with Mr. Francis he drew up the constitutions; he took the leading part in the solicitation of funds and the selection of the group of twenty-four Trustees, negotiated for the purchase of the New Building, attended the joint meeting with the Whitefield Trustees at the Coffee House at which the old property was transferred. As President of the Board of Trustees he presided at the frequent meetings of its early years and took an active part in the physical reconstruction of the New Building, ordering and receipting for wood, nails, and planks, engaging contractors and workmen and advancing their wages; in 1751 and 1752 he carried on the negotiations for a head of the institution, first with Dr. Johnson and, on their failure, with Dr. Smith, who was his personal selection. During the next few years this restless activity continued. Franklin gave for a while most of the leisure resulting from his retirement from business to the Academy and College. Short as the period was, this devotion and intelligent industry were at that stage absolutely invaluable.

Franklin's influence on the curriculum was, it is true, not predominant, but it was real; it was along two lines, larger recognition for science and more attention to the teaching of English. However inadequate and unsatisfactory these elements were in the actual curriculum of the College, that they were there at all was largely due to the initiation and insistence of Franklin. The prevailing classicism of Dr. Smith and the leading professor, Dr. Alison, was modified by the interest in English and physics of Franklin and his friend Professor Kinnersley.

There was a certain largeness in all Franklin's ideas. Although the new institution in 1749 was only called an academy, it was

the non-existence of a college in Philadelphia that he deplored in 1743. Although it was only the establishment of their free school the Trustees of the New Building insisted on in transferring it to the new Board, they agreed that it might be used also as a college. Even in its earliest days Franklin described it as "a foundation for posterity to erect into a college or seminary of learning more extensive and suitable for future circumstances." He would have rejoiced greatly in its development in these latter days to conform to the vast requirements of these "future circumstances."

The country or the city or the institution is fortunate whose life has been touched by that of a great man. It rises to a higher plane to conform to his reputation. His greatness is a constant stimulus to it. Reason for its ambitions and incentive for its efforts are found in a sense of properly belonging in great company. As Franklin became a national, then an international, then a legendary figure, the institution with which he had been connected shared in this wider repute. The influence of Franklin has probably been greater since his death than during his lifetime, greater on the University than on the colonial College. After it and he had passed away there grew up a tradition of Franklin that has meant much. His spirit has brooded over the University of Pennsylvania. Over and over again in the last century proposals have gained weight from a recognition that they were in accordance with the ideas of Franklin. He has been a sort of secular patron saint of the University; his example and his teaching have justified action.

During a long period in the University's history, during the later years of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, the tradition of Franklin was almost non-existent, to its loss. As this narrative continues it will be observed that those periods in which the institution had only a local life, when its ambitions ran low, were those periods in which Franklin was forgotten. The ages in which he was admired and remembered have also been times of College and University progress. Short as was the period of his direct influence over College affairs, imperfectly as the curriculum and the spirit of the colonial College or even the early University reflected his ideas, and

slowly as they have come into greater correspondence, his has been on the whole the strongest individual influence on its history. The most conspicuous location on the University grounds is a natural and proper place for his statue.

Chapter 5

LOW WATER

1791-1828

HANDICAPS

SO THE Trustees and Faculties of the state University and of the restored colonial College were merged into one body and began from the year 1791 a new life. No alumnus, however loyal, and no historian, however sunny, can contend that the united University in the later years of the eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth was a great institution. But neither were the other American colleges and universities of the time. All institutions have their times of depression. This was not a great academic age.

As to Pennsylvania, the whole period, from the union in 1791 for a generation, was a low tide in her affairs. Surrounding educational conditions were less favorable than they had been in colonial times. The needs of higher education in the state outside the city were being met by new institutions with the attraction of a religious conformity far more powerful than that exercised by the University with its higher but colder claim of freedom from religious predilections. Absence of sectarianism cost its price. Presbyterians had always gone by preference to Princeton, and now Dickinson at Carlisle, founded in 1783, gave a new opportunity to the Presbyterian Scotch-Irish population of its region. Franklin College at Lancaster, chartered in 1787, made provision for the youth of the German counties and so drew off a large possible contingent from the University.

The Quakers of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania might have

been expected to make use of college opportunities. They had excellent elementary schools, they were intelligent, great readers and good observers of nature. But they were not given to academic studies; and they had no need, as had the Anglicans, the Presbyterians, and even the Baptists, to train a learned ministry. In the far west of the state the academy which was to become the University of Pittsburgh was established in 1787. The University of Pennsylvania might be, as it has always been, the leading academic institution in the state; it was no longer the only one.

Geographical combined with religious conditions to make the University less attractive; Maryland, though its Revolutionary plan of a state university made up of twin colleges, one on the Eastern and one on the Western shore, had failed of realization, retained Washington College, which Dr. Smith had set up in 1782 during his period of exile, and thus educated at home some students who might otherwise have come to Philadelphia, as they had so often come in colonial times. William and Mary had passed through a reorganization. The state universities of Georgia and North and South Carolina were struggling into existence. Thus while New England Congregationalists frequented Yale, and Unitarians Harvard, and Presbyterians of the middle states came trooping to Princeton and Dickinson, Baptists to Brown, Anglicans to Columbia or William and Mary, Pennsylvania in the proud isolation of her freedom from religious bias found virtue, as usual, its own somewhat cold reward.

With its secularism Pennsylvania might be content, believing that all other higher institutions would eventually come around to her position. There were other characteristics of her organization that were equally unfavorable and not so admirable. It was a serious deficiency that she had no president, a personage that has played so characteristic and influential a part in the history of other American colleges and universities. The Provost in no way took the place of a responsible president. He was only in a most restricted sense the head of the institution. He had neither power nor real responsibility. These lay in the Board of Trustees. He was not only their appointee, he was in a certain sense their employee, often disregarded, limited, instructed, con-

trolled at every turn. He was merely one of the professors, with some precedence over his colleagues, considerable distinction and a higher salary, but with little influence on the administration of the institution. His position is plainly indicated in an early set of regulations, which provide "there shall be five professors, of whom one shall be Provost and one Vice-Provost." He had only the slightest connection with the Medical School, the most active and successful department of the University. A testy Provost in 1799 suggested that the titles "Provost" and "Vice-Provost" be abolished to avoid imposing upon the public by intimating that the holders have any "responsibility or superintendence." The devotion of many of the Trustees to their task, the powers given them by the charter, their sense of responsibility, their personal distinction in the life of the community, were beyond question. Strongly asserted, these reduced the position of the Provost, unless he was a man of unusual strength, almost to insignificance. The personal vigor of Dr. Smith had gone far to nullify this defect in the colonial College, but for almost a century he had no successor of equal assertiveness or any to whom actual power was conceded. During this long period the University sorely needed a real head.

The same superiority of position of the Trustees and their habitual regulation of what were purely educational matters disparaged and enfeebled the Faculty. The minuteness of control of the Trustees over curriculum, textbooks, hours of study and teaching, holidays, promotions, discipline, and all the daily relationships between teachers and students would be incredible except for the testimony of the written records.

The close interrelation between College and Academy was a weakness of organization. Until well into the nineteenth century the time and labor of all the professors except the Provost and Vice-Provost were given largely to administering their respective "schools" and teaching the younger boys. Genuine college professors they could hardly be when they were at the same time schoolmasters. The students belonging to the College and those belonging to the Academy were incompletely discriminated. Housed in the same building, in some subjects taught by the same masters, sitting sometimes in the same study room, boys

and young men ranging all the way from ten years old to twenty missed much of the exhilaration that comes from the distinction of academic rank between school and college.

Nor was the effect merely upon the pupils' feelings. The collegiate standard was debased by the admixture of schoolboy alloy. There was a steady pressure to advance the pupils from Academy to College grade at an abnormally early age. Early in the century a rule was adopted that no student should be admitted to college before reaching the age of fourteen. Nevertheless in a class of thirty-six students admitted soon afterward, eight were less than fourteen years old and were admitted under a suspension of the rules. It is recorded that the average age of the class of 1812 at graduation was under seventeen, and we hear of some students who entered at thirteen. It is true that the age of entrance to college throughout the country was extremely low according to modern standards. The cases of students graduated from Harvard, Yale, and elsewhere at fifteen or sixteen are familiar, though of course not typical. It may be said, generally speaking, that in the first quarter of last century students were graduated at about the age at which they now enter college.

Finally one thrill of "going to college" was not to be had by students coming to Pennsylvania. They did not live together in a college hall or dormitory, free from parental supervision, for the time largely their own masters, as they would be if they should go to Princeton or one of the New England institutions, or indeed to almost any college not in a large city. The old colonial dormitory building had not been restored to use after the Revolution; students lived at home or with relatives or in scattered boarding houses chosen by themselves or their parents.

To overcome these handicaps of the early part of the nineteenth century would require imagination, effort, and probably the passage of time. Some of them were characteristic of the age. One has only to consult the chronicles of other institutions to find what seem incidents of the same story. Loyal alumni of the present generation who would fain read the history of their alma mater as one of early greatness and continuous distinction must expect to be disappointed and to console themselves with such evidences of excellence and of contemporary recognition as they

can find. They existed at Pennsylvania even in this period of low water.

THE NEW HOME

The turn of the century saw the migration of the University from the first to the second of the three successive homes it has occupied; from the little group of buildings at Fourth and Arch streets, in which the drama of its colonial life had been played and the troubled period of division and reunion had been lived through, to the "President's House" on Ninth Street. Twice before, serious proposals for the abandonment of the old site had been made. The first was in 1771 when Dr. John Morgan, who was seeking subscriptions for the College and Medical School in the West Indies, exuberant by nature and warmed by the eloquence of his own carefully written appeal, became convinced that he would obtain more liberal contributions if he could say that an entirely new group of buildings was to be erected for what he was already calling the "University." This was a proposal for which the Trustees were not ready, as has been told before. The second was in 1784, at a time when it was believed that the College would soon resume its old buildings and that it might be necessary for the University to move elsewhere. The Trustees then remembered the lands they owned in Bucks County, "Norriton Farms," and considered moving there if they were displaced. This would have conformed to Franklin's old plan in the *Proposals*, to place the Academy "not many miles from the town . . . not far from a river": it would have equally anticipated Valley Forge, quite similarly situated. But the union took place before any change was made, and the combined institutions remained in the city.

At the union the University had the use both of the old buildings at Fourth and Arch and the rooms in the Philosophical building which the old University had occupied for the last two years. In 1794 the five years' lease of the Philosophical Society rooms ran out; the Society had a more desirable tenant in view and asked a higher rent, so the reunited institution momentarily crowded into the old buildings. The medical classes soon found more room elsewhere; but by 1800 the old buildings had be-

come antiquated and inadequate. The location itself was no longer convenient. Whereas it had at one time been on the very edge of the built-up city, population had now crept far out toward Broad Street.

The special inducement to move just now was an opportunity to acquire, as had been done in 1750, a building already erected, conveniently situated, roomy and not too unsuited to academic uses. In 1791, when the seat of the Federal government was removed from New York to Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania Legislature purchased a fine piece of ground on the west side of Ninth Street, running from Market to Chestnut, and erected upon it a large handsome building in which it was expected President Washington would live. It would be a Philadelphia "White House." The corner stone was laid on the tenth of May 1792, but the work of construction had proceeded slowly; new appropriations were required, and it was not until the spring of 1797 and after the expenditure of almost \$100,000 that the building was completed. It was a large and dignified structure. But by this time Washington's term was over. John Adams had been elected, and what had no doubt originally been intended as a free gift to the first President was now only offered on lease to the second, though he was allowed to name a rate of rent as low as any he could get elsewhere. President Adams, not attracted by this limited offer, and troubled, as he says, by constitutional doubts, returned a polite note to Governor Mifflin in March 1797 declining to occupy it.

The President's House, as it had come to be called, lay vacant, becoming increasingly out of repair, for three years. Proposals were made to use it as a mansion for the Governor of the state, and again to rent it as a hotel. Finally it was ordered, March 1800, to be sold at auction. The Trustees of the University saw their opportunity, negotiated with the state government, and in July of the same year bought the building for \$24,000 and the twelve attached lots for \$17,650, making a total price of \$41,650, payable in four instalments. To meet the cost they sold part of their old buildings on Fourth Street, including the Provost's House and the houses in which three of the professors had lived, retaining the two principal buildings, the hall, ultimately

to be used for the Academy, and the dormitory building, to be used partly for the Charity School, and in part as a dwelling house for Vice-Provost Andrews. They then sold enough of their remaining confiscated estates, their Pennsylvania bank stock and Federal bonds to make the early payments. They rented out parts of their new domain and built houses for the professors on its Chestnut Street front. Although considerable alterations were required to make the building usable for teaching purposes, these were completed in a year and by 1802 all the College and most of the Academy classes had been transferred to Ninth Street.

Hardly had the purchase of the Ninth Street building been announced in July 1800 when the five medical professors petitioned the Board to be "accommodated with a sufficient number of chambers in the New Building." They complained of the loss of time of their students in passing from the old buildings on Fourth Street, where some of their lectures were given, to Anatomical Hall on Fifth Street where they had their anatomy and chemistry. They pointed out that this building could be rented and the general income of the University thus be increased. Later this was done; the building was rented to the City Board of Health and for many years the University received a rent of \$400 a year from it. For the present the request of the medical professors was granted, so far as their principal lecture courses were concerned, and with only a little delay the transfer of their classes was made. Before the end of 1802 the medical students also were stretching their limbs in the President's House.

The University had now established itself in what we have already described as the second of its homes. There it was to remain for the next seventy years. What was to be the nature of its life in this new home?

FOUR DECADES OF TROUBLE
1791-1828

University and College had been impelled to unite principally by the need for funds and the hope of receiving support from the government of the state. The united institution continued long

to have the same need and to be lured on by the same hope. The income from the combined endowments and fees from students still showed no prospect of lifting the inherited load of debts or of paying such current expenses as the Trustees contemplated. They looked, however, with even greater confidence than their predecessors to the Legislature for support. One of their earliest actions was to draw up an address to the Assembly requesting further provision for their needs. The persistent dream of a university adequately supported by the Commonwealth on which its name reflected honor and whose population it enriched by a constant flow of ingenious and trained young people, has never been more skilfully expressed. Later requirements, later forms of service, later arguments for state subsidies for higher education have been formulated from time to time, but the bases of the claim are already stated in 1792. The appeal was presented to the Assembly early in January by a distinguished committee attending in person.

It was a long, persuasive, and astute letter. In addition to general arguments, it took for granted that the Assembly would proceed to provide whatever funds were necessary "to effectuate the great design of the Legislature in uniting the two former seats of learning lately subsisting in Pennsylvania." The Legislature was congratulated on "the foundation of one great seminary worthy of the capital of the Commonwealth," and "calculated to diffuse the rays of knowledge throughout the western world." It made a bid for the support of "our German brothers," who made up so great a proportion of the inhabitants of the state, by pointing out that the united institution had provided, as had the former University of the state, for a professor of the classics who would give his instruction in the German language and would also teach the English boys German. The University would thus supply ministers and teachers who could use both languages; and so, it was hoped, English would spread everywhere "and make us in all respects one people."

This was a reversion to Dr. Smith's proposals made to his British colleagues of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, to extend their work among the ignorant Germans of Pennsylvania threatened by Roman Catholic and French propaganda,

as indeed also to Franklin's promise to make his Academy, among other things, a preparatory school for common school teachers throughout the state. But education among the Germans was taking quite another course, and neither this nor other arguments of the University got its application for funds beyond the stage of reference to a committee. A year later, in January 1793, a second appeal was made and was referred for consideration to "a grand committee." But neither appeals to their pride, reminders of their duty, nor assurance of the usefulness of the University to the state extracted any support from the Legislature, and the expectation of a close connection between the state government and the University gradually faded away.

All other sources of income were exploited. The confiscated lands still remaining in their hands were sold. In December 1795 a thousand pounds had to be borrowed from the Bank of Pennsylvania on the personal credit of the Trustees. A timely windfall of some thousand pounds resulted from a decision by the Supreme Court of the state concerning some old lands. This was promptly invested in mortgages and in the stock of state and Federal banks. But it was not enough. The day of balanced budgets and of liberal expenditures seemed still far off.

Relations between the College Faculty and the Trustees were strained. The plan of teaching imposed upon the Faculty by the Board at the union became more and more distasteful to them, and they were convinced that it lay at the base of the evident failure of the College to obtain students or popular support. Five years after its adoption the Faculty writes, "We have complied with your new mode of education . . . although we fore-saw it would ruin the institution . . . the consequences have proved our prediction," and a year later, "while this continues the seminary will never flourish." Provost Ewing's letters to the Board—there was no other means of communication between Faculty and Trustees than through the ordinary mails—became more and more acrimonious and later, as his health failed, petulant and even offensive. He counsels abandonment of the examinations of the students in public, which have long become, as he says, a "solemn farce." He urges over and over again a return to the curriculum of the University of the state. His letters re-

mained frequently unanswered. Other professors also occasionally wrote tart letters, and appealed against the conditions that were imposed upon them. They protested against the "slavish confinement" of attendance through the whole of every day, while in all other colleges and schools in the state, they say, two afternoons in the week are free for both students and instructors. One professor reports that the curriculum, so far as it affects his subject, is in form a "curious novelty," but that in principle it has long been tried and found wanting. They want themselves to appoint the tutors who are to assist them. The salaries of all the professors except the Provost and Vice-Provost were dependent in part on the fees of their students, payable only when the students attended; in these days when, as in 1793 and 1794, the yellow fever drove the well-to-do inhabitants out of town for long summer seasons, there were many months in which the professors received no income from their teaching.

On the other hand, on May 27, 1797, a committee of the Board visits the University and learns that the College classes are not meeting that day because the Provost is "indisposed" and the Vice-Provost has gone out of town on business and his return has been delayed. Failure begets recrimination. There were at that time only three students in the senior, nine in the junior, and none in the third class. It is no wonder that the committee reports that "the institution appears to be in a declining state." There is of course a brighter side to the story, as will presently appear, but so far as the period immediately after the union of 1791 was one of reorganization of the collegiate department it was less happy than the previous period in the life of either of the older institutions.

Provost Ewing's health and temper became steadily worse until in January 5, 1802, the Trustees resolve that his health will not allow him to maintain his authority or to perform his duties as Provost and Professor and that his salary shall cease except as to an undefined pension. A month later he writes to the Trustees that he will leave it to the public to judge whether the low state of the University "is to be ascribed to my want of health and strength or to your own operations by undertaking to manage the education and discipline of the University with-

out the advice and contrary to the opinion of your Professors who are daily with the students, observe their conduct and deficiencies." He had never been allowed to direct the students' education "without the interference of the Trustees." However, he died ten months later, December 7, 1802. It is indicative of the low state of the University that no Provost was appointed for four years, when Dr. John McDowell of the class of 1771, for some years a tutor, and later Professor of Mathematics at St. John's College, Maryland, became Provost and carried on a colorless administration till 1810. In that year Vice-Provost Andrews, of the class of 1765, amiable and learned, a typical school teacher, already sixty-five years of age, was promoted to the provostship, filled it obscurely, and retired from it three years later, accepting gratefully the kindly pension the Trustees voted him.

The first two decades of the nineteenth century were the lowest period in the history of the College. For the first ten years of the century the college course was only two years, for the second decade only three. In 1804 there were only eight students in the senior class, six in the junior; in 1807 only seventeen altogether; and in 1812 sixteen seniors, fifteen juniors, and thirteen freshmen. Its weakness must be acknowledged but need not be given more attention than is its due. The twenties were somewhat better. Their improvement was foreshadowed by the appointment of Dr. Frederick Beasley as Provost in 1813. Why he was chosen does not appear. He was a southerner, from North Carolina. Although a graduate of Princeton and for some years a tutor there, he was ordained as an Anglican and served as rector of two or three parishes successively. At thirty-six years of age he was elected Professor of Moral Philosophy and Provost of the University. He was intellectually quite competent for the position. In the course of his career he wrote a number of philosophical, controversial, and political essays, and made some impress on the small body of early American metaphysicians by his *Search for Truth*. He was given the degree of D.D. by both Pennsylvania and Columbia in 1815. Even in the sphere of administration at the time of his election he gave promise. He declared that measures must be taken "to raise the College from its present

state of depression and decay and infuse new life and vigor into it." Immediately after his induction into office he made a tour among the near-by colleges to examine into their organization. He then presented to the Trustees a long report in which he made two rather drastic recommendations: the first that all students now in the upper classes who could not really qualify for their present standing should be placed in lower classes; second, that the age of admission should be raised to sixteen or at least to fifteen years. Freshmen should on entrance show familiarity with a given list of Latin and Greek texts not markedly different from the classical works required by the University within recent years.

Two silver medals now lying in the University Museum, given to students at the Commencement of 1814, are surviving witnesses to another of Dr. Beasley's beliefs, that marks of approval of achievement and good behavior would prove more influential than prevailing forms of discipline. Twenty-eight such medals were procured and two of them were bestowed, but for some reason the practice of giving them was later disapproved and the remaining specimens have disappeared. The new Provost believed in the pomp and circumstance of academic life, and wanted professors and students to wear their gowns on all ceremonial occasions. He asked that one of the rooms in the building, which must still have retained many of the domestic characteristics of the President's House, should be assigned for a chapel or hall, in which the daily religious services might be followed by orations and declamations; and that from time to time there should be occasions of ceremony accompanied with lights and decorations to which the public should be invited.

The influence of the Provost was exerted to obtain approval and a favored position for the Philomathean Society. He seems to have counted much on oratory and open debates to attract the attention and sympathy of the community. What Dr. Beasley wanted was evidently a general awakening and stiffening up of the whole institution. With this desire the Trustees sympathized and for such purposes they accepted several of his suggestions. But with the curriculum, the subjects to be taught, the methods of teaching them, the arrangement of hours and holidays, the

higher discipline of the students, they would brook no interference. A body of "Rules and Regulations" of much definiteness and formality had been recently drawn up. These, they declared, must be accepted and conformed to by the Provost and Faculty even though they extended into the field of the daily routine of instruction and discipline of the students.

When numbers, discipline, and attendance still remain unsatisfactory as the years passed, successive committees inquire into conditions. They concerned themselves largely with Faculty deviations from the regulations of the Board. When answers to a questionnaire sent to all members of the Faculty brought unsatisfactory replies, the Board resolved that "It appears that the Rules ordained by the Trustees for the government of the University are not complied with in two particulars; the rules in relation to these particulars must be henceforth enforced and complied with as well as in all other cases." These rules were for holidays and for the number and order of recitations. The Faculty had met the problem of repeated absence of whole classes from recitations, apparently with the connivance of their parents, by offering an occasional extra day of freedom as a reward for regular attendance, satisfactory work, and good behavior. The Board expressed strong resentment against this unauthorized action of the Faculty and insisted on exact conformity with the rules for holidays. The same difficulty arose in regard to the order of recitations, the Faculty wishing to vary the sequence the Trustees insisting on the arrangement already prescribed. Discipline was at that time very bad; when the Faculty asked authorization for a change in practice the Board refused to give this on the ground that the professors already had sufficient power to enforce order through the system of marks. Rumors reached the Trustees that some of the professors did not remain at college until the end of the afternoon, although the rules required that both professors and students should remain at the recitations or study from nine to five, except for the lunch hour and the Saturday half-holiday. It seemed a hopeless condition of conflict of ideas and practices.

The very numbers, distinction, and ability of the Trustees at the time gave them confidence in their own judgment: Chi-

Justice Tilghman, Horace Binney and John Sargeant, William Rawle and J. R. Ingersoll, famous Philadelphia lawyers, Nicholas Biddle, President of the Bank of the United States, Bishop White and Peter DuPonceau, all men of eminence, most of them college graduates, many of them also Trustees of other public institutions in which their powers were more direct, hopelessly outclassed the little group of four or five men to whom the imposing name of "Faculty" was given.

The respect for their traditional control of the institution was none the less because five of the Trustees of that time were men whose fathers had been Trustees before them, and two others were of the third generation of membership; other relationships by birth or marriage existed. Election to the Board of Trustees of the University was a coveted distinction, a mark of social standing in Philadelphia. The position of a professor or even of the Provost bore no comparison in social recognition with that of a member of the Board of Trustees. The tradition of a self-governing and self-perpetuating body of men of prominence, having the University in their keeping and controlling it to the minutest detail, was a well-established one. There was no department of its activities which was deliberately placed under the control of the Faculty, or which was not subject to the decision and action of the Trustees at any time.

One Trustee in 1827, deplored the bad condition into which the University had fallen, expresses the fear that "at no distant period, there will be nothing left of the University of Pennsylvania but its Board of Trustees." That is to say, in the last resort the University was the Board of Trustees. Many of the Trustees took these responsibilities very seriously. Of course many were not interested. A study of the minutes and committee reports has left the writer of this work with the impression, perhaps only an impression, that about half of the Board of Trustees were apt at any one time to be interested in the duties and opportunities of their position and reasonably regular attendants at the Board meetings. The interest of many of these regular attendants was deep and devoted. Most of the work of the Board, however, as in other such bodies, was done by committees, and much of the committee work was done by the chairman. There have been few

periods, from the time of Franklin down, when there were not some men on the Board who were devoting a large part of their time with much self-sacrifice to University affairs. Ordinarily it was these men who governed the University, within the bounds of the prejudices and fixed ideas of their colleagues. At other times the University simply drifted.

Although the term "Faculty" was constantly used, the unity of organization intimated by that term scarcely existed. The Board of Trustees communicated with members of the Faculty by letter or conversation individually, not as a body. Although meetings of the professors were provided for by the rules, they were in the first quarter of the century seldom held. The first known minute book of the Faculty of the Department of Arts dates from 1826. It records regular weekly meetings, but these meetings seem to have been little more than occasions for complaints by certain professors of student disorders and "arraignments" of individual offenders. The professors had little contact with one another at other times, and relations among them were often unfriendly on account of the unfortunate financial arrangements by which the fees of students were somewhat irregularly divided among them. Influence could have been exercised by so small a body only if they had possessed power, cultivated unity, and were men of unusual ability working under favorable surroundings. None of these conditions characterized the position of the Faculty in the early part of the nineteenth century.

The matter of discipline was a contested point between the Faculty and Trustees. Behavior of students was very bad. A committee remarks in 1824: "That a deficiency exists either in the system or the administration of college discipline is too obvious to be denied or doubted." Most of the misbehavior was mere childishness. Provost Beasley and Dr. Patterson and Professor Thomson at various times complained of students rolling shot or pebbles about the floor, bringing musical instruments or animals into classes to distract the attention of students and teachers, or ridiculing the professors behind their backs, the bolder ones defying them to their faces; behaving in all those petty ways by which college boys in olden times used, by a strange line of reasoning, to try to prove by childish behavior that they were

college men. There was similar curious subservience to college ringleaders, such as the one referred to by the Provost as "one of the most refractory and ill designing young men that I have ever become acquainted with in any college." However, this particular young man was expelled, after which the remaining students showed a greater spirit of independent judgment.

College discipline was at this time, as it long remained, a nation-wide problem. Without mentioning small colleges, diaries of Harvard students in the twenties chronicle shuffling to drown professors' voices in the classroom and chapel, throwing inky water over the professors as they emerged from their rooms, oaths taken to stay away from classes in college altogether till expelled classmates were reinstated and informers disclosed. In 1823 the Harvard Faculty expelled forty-three students of a class of seventy. In 1828, according to a contemporary newspaper, the opinion was prevalent in New England that at Harvard "all was not as it should be; we heard too often of riots and rebellions, and it was known that there was much of undisguised and unpunished dissipation; in fact the College failed to realize the expectations of the public and the hopes of its friends." After some investigation "it was a general opinion either that the system of education was a bad one or that it was badly administered . . . the instruction was found to be inadequate and by no means what the public had a right to expect from the funds of the College and the number of instructors; and the modes of punishment were ascertained to be deficient in principle and insufficient in their operation."¹

At Yale there were expulsions in 1828, withdrawals of students to their homes in protest against Faculty action, classroom disturbances and other disorders of which the contemporary newspapers were full. At Princeton ever since the beginning of the century there had been disorders; in 1802 the students were thought to be responsible for a fire in the college; in 1812 and 1814 there were more "uprisings," another fire and an explosion and defacement of the walls. Fourteen students were dismissed in the especially disorderly year 1816. These institutions are

¹ Morison, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-33; N.Y. *Evening Post*, Nov. 21, 1825; Aug. 4, 7, 20, 1828.

mentioned because their records are easily accessible. There is no reason to doubt the existence of similar conditions in other colleges.

Therefore when in 1828 the Faculty at Pennsylvania appealed to the Trustees for assistance in securing discipline, it was rather an instance of that parallelism in the history of American colleges that strikes one whenever he dips into their chronicles than anything peculiar to this. There is no doubt, however, that the condition of the University remained unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the evidences of intellectual interest to which we shall call attention later, the number of students attending remained small, seldom reaching more than fifty or sixty, while the largest number of graduates in any year within this period was twenty-six. Attendance as well as discipline was bad. In 1822 from ninety-five recitations in a certain subject, one student had been absent thirty-nine times, another thirty-eight, and still another thirty-four. The professors felt compelled to accept the excuses they brought from home on the ground of sickness. Numbers were so small that they could not risk withdrawals.

Whatever the cause of the failure of the institution to flourish, the conviction grew on the Trustees that it was due to lack of devotion and ability on the part of the Faculty, and more especially to the unsuitability of Provost Beasley for his position. He seems to have been entirely unaware of this growing dissatisfaction, for he continued to write letters to the Board, often with implied criticism, but with unbroken optimism and hope for better times if the professors are given their head. He writes, for instance, concerning the rebuke to the Faculty for granting extra holidays: "I do not think it of any importance that a few days more should be allowed by law to the students, but the matter is that the Faculty should be allowed occasionally to exercise their power . . . which is allowed to the Faculties of other Colleges." In October 1820 the Provost wrote to the Board a letter concerning which the minutes record, "a letter was received from the Provost which being read was returned."

As a matter of fact just such conflicts between the Overseers and the Faculty were then in progress at Harvard and between Trustees and Faculty at Princeton, and at other colleges. Their

respective powers were not yet delimited; but in most other institutions the Faculty had a President to establish the balance. At Pennsylvania the differences soon came to a head. April 1, 1828, a committee of the Trustees appointed to consider the representations of the Faculty with respect to discipline went further and took up the whole question of abuses in College and defects in the existing system of teaching. In accordance with their report, at the meeting of July 2 the Board adopted a drastic resolution for the reorganization of the Faculty, to the effect that at the end of the term all existing professorships in the Department of Arts should be vacated and a new Faculty elected. This did not involve so great a change as might have been expected. Vice-Provost Robert M. Patterson had just accepted a call to the University of Virginia as Professor of Natural Science. This left of the Faculty only Professor Robert Adrain, who had just been called from Rutgers as Professor of Mathematics and would certainly be reëlected, and three members who would probably not be reëlected: the Provost, Professor J. G. Thomson, and the one tutor, Garrett van Gelder.

It was undoubtedly the desire to get rid of Provost Beasley that prompted this extreme action. What was the head and front of his offending does not appear. He himself was quite astounded and could think of no reason for his dismissal. Nor does any explanation appear beyond the report of the committee that "a want of confidence in the capacity of the Provost for the government of such an institution is the main and leading cause of the distressing condition into which it has fallen." In answer Dr. Beasley questions as others had before him and were to after him, "Am I to be considered as responsible for the ill results of a scheme acknowledged on all hands to be so radically defective in itself . . . operating in the midst of a population so unconcerned about its interests?"

On removing from office the Provost and Professor Thomson the Board voted a grant of \$1,800 a year to the former and \$853.33 a year to the latter for three years. No provision seems to have been made for the tutor. The minute book of the Faculty of Arts recording their special meeting, April 30, 1828, notes the resignation of Professor Patterson and closes with the succinct state-

ment, "Dr. Beasley, Mr. Thomson and Mr. VanGelder also leave the institution, in consequence of a recent resolution of the Trustees. So the present faculty adjourned, never to meet again."¹

Among all the broils of the period, steps in advance were taken. In 1819 the extension of the course to four years and the addition of another professor to the Faculty were recommended by a committee of the Board, and although there was much delay, in 1825 these were finally approved. At the same time the Academy scholars were at last separated from those in the College by removing them to the old buildings on Fourth Street. On the whole also the number of students in the College began to climb. Although there were some lean years when only a handful of students attended, and in 1801, 1806, 1809, and 1816 none were graduated, the average number of graduates which between 1799 and 1818 was only a little over eight, between 1818 and 1828 was more than fifteen. The unsatisfactory relations between Trustees and Faculty did not altogether prevent progress, nor was all the time of the students devoted to mischief.

The period closed with a disconcerting if not necessarily calamitous financial crisis. This was the discovery in June 1829 of a serious theft of the University's funds by the Secretary-Treasurer. A committee engaged in an investigation found that the accounts of this trusted officer showed a deficiency of \$16,224.58. Other defalcations appeared later increasing the amount. He was bonded for \$10,000 and this was collected from his sureties, one of them himself a Trustee. The defaulter applied for relief from further payments under the insolvency act, but whether the University was nevertheless able to recoup its general loss does not appear. Indeed the whole occurrence is recorded in such impersonal terms as to suggest the possibility that there were reasons of social relationship that made the Board anxious to call as little public attention to the matter as possible.

One specific loss, however, appears in the records some fifteen years later. Among his peculations the defaulting Treasurer had

¹ See the interesting account of this obscure series of events by C. S. Thompson in the *General Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, October 1930 and January 1931; Minutes of College Faculty.

appropriated \$5,000 obtained by the theft of the whole of a certain bond and one-half of another. This was part of the Keble fund. The University had received by bequest from John Keble in the year 1809 a number of houses and ground rents, the income from which was to be used for the education of poor children. The Trustees had allowed the income to accumulate until in 1823 they were in a position to establish the Keble School alongside the old Charity School. In July 1825 the old Charity School was educating forty-nine boys and twenty-nine girls, and John Bullock, teacher of the Keble School, had thirty-six boys under his charge. In 1827 they were able to invest the funds in two mortgages, one of \$4,000, the other of \$2,000. It was from these the defaulter had secured the part of his plunder named above. Even the remaining half of the \$2,000 mortgage was of no value, for the property on which it was loaned sold for less than that amount. However, the houses of the original bequest were still in the University's possession as late as 1848, bringing in an income of something more than \$600 a year. In 1829 the school is still mentioned, but after that year the fund seems to have been used to increase the income of the old Charity School, and the Keble School disappears from the records.¹

INTELLECTUAL INTERESTS

In this little group of immature students and overworked professors intellectual activity was by no means wanting. The professors were genuine scholars. Provost Ewing, although his later years were embittered by disappointment, conflict, and bad health, had a long career of scientific eminence. His statement that he had written his lectures "on chemistry, pneumatics, optics and astronomy" years before but had corrected and added to them as scientific investigation proceeded, is corroborated by his *Plain Elementary and Practical System of Natural Experimental*

¹ John Keble was an Englishman living in Philadelphia. He had been for three years a "Bluecoat boy" in London, and on his death in 1807 left his estate of some \$90,000 in the hands of trustees to be distributed according to their judgment among Philadelphia charitable institutions. It was divided among fourteen of which the University, because of its interest in free education, was considered one.

Philosophy, published in 1809, after his death, apparently representing his regular course. His reputation was based more largely on his engineering services in defining the boundaries of three states and his observations on the transits of Mercury and Venus. Dr. Andrews published a *System of Logick*, which went through several editions and was used at Princeton. He wrote also *Elements of Rhetorick and Belles Lettres*, published in 1813. A graduate of the class of 1803 gives a pleasant glimpse of Dr. Andrews' class.

He read to us lectures on Moral Philosophy. We studied Logic from a small compend prepared by himself. After the regular business of the morning Dr. Andrews would spend some time in informal remarks on any subject that would occur to him, the last book which he had read, perhaps, gradually passing to something else so that each of these occasions would give us quite a variety of matter to think upon and led us to read many books which otherwise would not have been sought— He generally closed with some pleasing remark which would raise a smile, then rising from his seat and slightly inclining himself towards us he would with a long and kind look at us bid the “Young gentlemen” good morning.¹

Dr. James Davidson wrote a popular Latin grammar published in 1798. Professor Robert Patterson prepared a *Compend of Spherical Geometry and Trigonometry* and many mathematical studies and was president of the American Philosophical Society.

This rather unpromising period also saw the foundation of those literary and debating societies that have ever since been a characteristic part of college life. Groups of young men interested in law or medicine or politics or music or in general self-improvement have been noted a generation earlier among applicants for the use of the old College rooms; but they were outsiders. The societies we now come upon were made up of students in college, including sometimes a few alumni. Some of them were short-lived, others have had an active existence to our own time.

A bundle of incomplete minutes, dating from the year 1807, are the only memorial of what appears to be the oldest of these

¹ Biography of John McAllister, Jr. of the Class of 1803, MS., by his son, Thomas Hamilton McAllister, of the class of 1843 (written Jan. 1874).

organizations, formed in February of that year, the Philological Society. It consisted at this time of five seniors and eleven juniors.¹ It had a room in the northeastern corner of the third floor of the Ninth Street building. Some of the professors acted as patrons. Its members debated, made orations, elected one another to office, fined one another and excused the fines, much in the way of all college literary societies. Their debates rang the changes on the rights and wrongs of slavery, the relative advantages of agriculture and commerce as the basis of a nation's prosperity, whether the city or the country is the best location for a college, whether the bar or the ministry is the better profession, and other such theoretical and practical subjects. The orations were sometimes original, at other times "Othello's Address to the Venetian Senate," "Hector's Reproach to Paris," and such triumphs of ancient and modern eloquence. After five years this society came to a rather abrupt end. One of its members by his ill behavior won repeated fines and ultimate expulsion from the society, then brought disgrace upon it, according to the view of the other members, by further "scandalous action," culminating in the publication of a "libel" upon it. At any rate, in 1812 it was in such bad odor that the Trustees denied the members, now mostly graduates, the further use of their room.

The next society to be formed, the well-known and still active Philomathean Society, had a special position. It was formed by the senior class in 1813 with the interested support of the newly elected Provost, Dr. Frederick Beasley. He had advised the formation of such a society in his letter of recommendations for reforms sent to the Board of Trustees at the time of his election, and on November 23, 1813, he informs the Board that such a society has been formed, gives it his strong approval and asks for the official sanction and support of the Trustees, their encouragement and the grant to it of a room in the College building instead of the use of his own recitation room, which is the only place they have so far had for their meetings. The Trustees thereupon sanction the institution of the society, ordering that "a suitable room should be appropriated to their use." This promise has been honored ever since, though there have been times when

¹ University of Pennsylvania *Library Chronicle*, V, 80-87.

their accommodations were not so good as the spacious group of rooms in the northeast corner of the third floor of the President's House which they had inherited from the Philological Society. A sheet of paper still lies among the society's archives bearing the names of the thirteen founders, with a declaration of the objects of their organization. Light is thrown on the prevailing age of college students by their rule that none should be admitted to the society under fifteen years of age. It is of interest to remark also that of the sixteen members who were ultimately admitted from this first class, five subsequently became lawyers, three clergymen, five merchants or bankers, one a farmer, and two followed no profession. This was not an unrepresentative classification of Pennsylvania graduates, aside from the medical department, at that time and for long afterward. It was not, like most other contemporary colleges, a nursery of ministers.

More than once "Philo," presuming upon its semi-official position, asked for money grants; the Trustees would then give them \$40 for their library or help pay the expenses of their annual exercises. In gratitude the society at one time elected the whole Board of Trustees honorary members and expressed a hope that they would sometimes attend the meetings.

There are ups and downs in the lives of associations as of institutions, and in the late twenties "Philo" seems to have become a focus of disorder. Its own moderator found himself powerless against disturbers and had to dissolve successive meetings. This was said to be due to what were then called "nominal" members. These were men who were neither "junior" nor "senior" members, but students who had been dropped or had withdrawn from college yet still continued to attend the society meetings. They became so troublesome that in 1832 Provost DeLancey threatened to deprive the society of its rooms. On the other hand many of the best students continued to join "Philo"; its Commencements attracted attention, its prizes were seriously competed for, and a lengthening line of students prominent in their college course, and of alumni who attained high positions in the world, made membership constantly more attractive. Early in its history, by a curious chance, Henry D. Gilpin '19, afterwards Attorney-General of the United States, James M. Mason, '18,

United States Senator from Virginia at the outbreak of the Civil War and Commissioner from the Confederate States to Great Britain and France in 1862, and Robert J. Walker '19, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States under President Polk, Governor of Kansas Territory in 1857 and '58, and Senator from Mississippi at the outbreak of the war, were successive moderators of "Philo." As in colonial times there was even yet a certain connection between the South and Pennsylvania.

In May 1829, influenced perhaps by the new building and the new spirit which, as we shall see, characterized the immediately succeeding years, a new and rival debating society, the Zelosophic, obtained the approval of the authorities and the assignment of meeting rooms. Its founders were seven members of the junior class of that year whose numbers were rapidly added to and who seem to have had particularly close relation with Professor Copée and some other new members of the Faculty. Within five years they had begun the publication of a dignified literary journal containing thoughtful essays, short stories, and some poetry rather above the undergraduate level. Debates and orations, ultimately in competition with other societies and colleges, kept up its interest and membership. Scores, probably hundreds, of other societies of a literary, scientific, or professional character have since arisen and duly fallen, or, amid the greater diversification of the institution, still exist, but "Philo" and "Zelo" have remained through all subsequent changes witnesses of the intellectual interests of the small institution as it approached the end of its first century.

It is indeed remarkable how many men from the small classes of the University of this time attained eminence in later life. Only once in the first two decades of the century were there more than fifty students in the College department, frequently there were not more than twenty, once only ten. From the class that had graduated two years before "Philo" was formed, however, one graduate, S. B. How, became President of Dickinson College, another, T. K. Carroll, Governor of Maryland, and another, the valedictorian of his class, Thomas P. Bennett of Easton, Maryland, while he was still in College made a transcript of Professor Patterson's *Compend*, which drew the special commendation of

that excellent mathematician. In this work he laid down the admirable doctrine worthy of continual remembrance, that "Nothing should be produced from this seat of learning and science but what is either excellent in thought or elegant in diction." The Latin salutatorian of the class of 1812, Richard S. Mason, became successively President of Hobart College and of Delaware College. John Meredith Read, who graduated in 1812 at fifteen and delivered on that occasion an address on "The Amelioration of the Penal Code," held successively almost all political offices in Pennsylvania, and was nominated to the Supreme Court by President Polk, but withdrew his name under pressure from southern senators objecting to his free-soil views. He became Chief Justice of Pennsylvania. He was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President but turned his local support to Lincoln. William Meredith, who entered at thirteen, the youngest member of his class, became its valedictorian and afterwards held successively a long list of legal and judicial offices. He was Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and was offered the position of Counsellor of the United States at the Geneva Arbitration Conference of 1877. Many other names of distinction might be added.

If this chronicle should seem to the reader to record too much of mere personalities and dwell too much on the contrast between the fecklessness of these callow youths while in college and the achievements of their later lives, it may be remembered that there is the possibility of judging too much from numbers and deplored too deeply that Pennsylvania was at one time only a small college, such as Daniel Webster loved.

Another form of intellectual interest of this period sprang from the unpromising soil of the financial relations of the University to the state. These had not improved, from the University's point of view, since the failures of the applications made directly after the union of 1791.

The requirements of the Act of Union that the University should make an annual report on its finances to the Legislature were punctiliously fulfilled, but the hope that this would be followed by corresponding appropriations was just as regularly disappointed. A new complication was introduced by the purchase

by the University from the state in 1800 of the President's House. After the original payment a second and third instalment were paid, each to an amount of some \$10,000, but the fourth instalment, with accompanying charges, amounting to \$10,100.79 was in 1807, according to the Controller-General of the state, long overdue. Indeed in October of that year he declared that unless settlement was soon made he must take action that would be extremely disagreeable to him and, presumably, still more so to the University. There followed, as an alternative to this payment, in the next few years a series of plans and efforts that bade fair to add an interesting and wholly new phase to the University's activities. Relations between the finances and the curriculum must justify a short disquisition on the subject of botany.

Few intellectual interests were more widespread in the early years of the nineteenth century than what might be called research in medical botany. A whole continent with an almost unexplored flora lay at their doors; what might it not contain for the cure of disease? Almost all medicines were then drawn from the vegetable kingdom. Botany and *materia medica* lay very close together. Equally interesting was the possibility the study of plants offered of an improvement in agriculture. Pure scientific curiosity followed close on practical usefulness. Of this scientific interest Philadelphia was the recognized center. Their city was described in 1816 by an enthusiastic group of botanists as "The Hot-bed of Sciences, the nursery of the Arts and the Home of Philosophy." A scientific man speaks of botany as "a favorite study among us." The story of John Bartram's "conversion" is a familiar one. After describing his sudden awakening of interest as he examined a flower while resting from his plowing, "I returned to my plow, but the new desire did not quit my mind. At last I could not resist the impulse, for on the fourth day of the following week I hired a man to plow for me and went, as many a man in search of wisdom has gone, to Philadelphia."

The University did not long remain uninfluenced by this "favorite study." Science has appeared in her annals in three quite different forms: one as an adjunct to the study of medicine, another as an intellectual interest, not unlike the classics or history or pure mathematics, the third as a form of profes-

sional training the immediate object of which was to prepare the student to make a living by applying his scientific knowledge in some field of practical usefulness. These various objects of scientific study doubtless overlap, the first and second being of occasional usefulness to society; the last having its own claims to an intellectual interest and value. In this practical sense it was not to appear till later in the century, and may be left for mention till that time. The first and second were acknowledged from the very beginning. Thanks largely to the interests of Franklin, Smith, and Kinnersley, pure science had never been entirely absent from college teaching, and in the first group of medical instructors Dr. Adam Kuhn was Professor of *Materia Medica* and Botany.

In 1789 in the restored College, Dr. Benjamin Smith Barton, who had in the traditional manner studied at Edinburgh, but actually took his medical degree at Göttingen, was elected Professor of Botany and Natural History, the first professorship with that specific title in the United States. At the union, in 1791, he was continued as Professor of Natural History in the College and was elected at the same time Professor of *Materia Medica* in the Medical School; later he became in addition Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine. In 1803 he published the *Elements of Botany*, the first textbook on that subject issued in America and, except for the great French book of Michaux, published the same year, the first systematic work on the plants of the United States. Besides his work in the Medical School, Barton gave a course of general botanical lectures every year to a small class of students from whom, as he says, "the emoluments were small but the satisfaction great."

A reputation for scientific subjects had evidently reached President Jefferson, for in writing to Dr. Wistar for advice as to the education of his grandson, a boy of fifteen years of age, he remarks, "There are particular branches of science which are not so advantageously taught anywhere else in the United States as in Philadelphia," and a few years later speaking of the teaching of mathematics and natural philosophy at William and Mary, he says, "I prefer it to any college I know, except that at

Philadelphia; and, for boys, to that also, because that is a great city while Williamsburg is but an academical village."¹

It was in 1806, however, that the University deliberately proposed the extension of its scientific work. In that year the Medical Faculty appointed Dr. Barton to draft an address to the Board of Trustees asking that steps be taken toward establishment of a public botanical garden in Philadelphia like the private gardens already in existence and the public gardens which had recently been opened in New York and in another American city. It was an old project; the Philadelphia College of Physicians, which included in its membership the whole Medical Faculty of the University, had petitioned the Assembly for the establishment of such a garden March 14, 1788. In 1806, likewise, Dr. Rush was appointed by the Medical Faculty to make an appeal to the state Legislature for support for the garden and for the Medical School. From that time for the next twenty years a botanical garden in Philadelphia was an object of general discussion. The suggestion was made by someone that the financial relation of the University to the state might be made conducive to success in carrying out this plan. The Trustees therefore early in 1807 asked the state government for a postponement of the final settlement of their debt and placed before it a request that the whole or part of the remainder of this debt should be remitted on condition that the University should establish a botanical garden. This proposal they considered would commend itself to the Legislature from its evident public utility to medicine and agriculture, and at the same time would further the scientific study of botany. Indeed, the whole plan may well have been the suggestion of Dr. Barton, always more interested in botany than in medicine.

In answer to their appeal the Legislature granted to the Trustees on March 18, 1807, out of the money owed by the University to the state the sum of \$3,000, "for the purpose of

¹ Thomas Jefferson to Caspar Wistar, 1807, quoted in Francis N. Thorpe, *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania*, Washington, 1892, p. 7; Thomas Jefferson to Elizabeth Frist, Nov. 23, 1816; quoted from MS in Mass. Hist. Soc. by R. J. Honeywell, *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, p. 112.

enabling them to establish a garden for the improvement of the Science of Botany and for instituting a series of experiments to ascertain the cheapest and best food for plants."

This grant gave the desired relief from immediate payment but provided no disposable funds, and it was not till eight years later, when the death of Dr. Barton precipitated the question of what should be done with his double, or triple, professorship, that the subject was again seriously taken up. As to Barton's professorship in the Medical School, his work was for the time divided by the other professors among themselves, but the medical students, always a rebellious group, would have none of this arrangement, nor would they accept the choice of Dr. Dorsey, as had been the wish of Dr. Barton, to fill both chairs. A hundred of them signed a letter of protest, and from several applicants for the professorships another choice was made. The number of students had so increased that the medical professorships had become profitable as well as honorable and so were objects of competition.

There were also rival applicants for Dr. Barton's other position, his professorship of botany and natural history in the College; it was evidently desirable if not lucrative. Among the competitors was the naturalist C. R. Rafinesque—vain and eccentric, but gifted and influential, a true cosmopolitan, born in Constantinople from French and German parents, and educated in Italy, a recent immigrant to America and for most of his life a resident of Philadelphia. He wrote now from the luxurious home of Chancellor Livingston in Clermont, New York, and set in motion all possible lines of influence and intrigue to obtain the position. He wished to teach his "New Natural Method of Botany" and thus become "the American Linnæus." He would prefer to be elected professor of natural history, which would include both zoölogy and botany, but would be satisfied with a professorship in either subject. However, W. P. C. Barton, nephew and pupil of the elder Barton, who had been long in training for this position, also applied and, with the use of some influence and some slight misrepresentation of his uncle's promises, was elected. In November, 1815, he began a course of lectures on "Elementary Philosophical and Medical

Botany," the opening lecture given in the College Chapel, the remainder of the course in the old Anatomical Hall on Fifth Street.

In the same month a committee of the Board of Trustees was at last appointed to report on the best method of carrying out the intentions of the Legislature in making the grant of 1807. Since that grant had provided no funds, the Trustees proceeded to issue an appeal to the public for the means to purchase and equip a garden. By the active efforts of Professor W. P. C. Barton and with the support of the lately formed Linnaean Society, of which he was President, they secured a considerable sum, although evidently inadequate for the purpose.

Just at this time, February 1816, a group of gentlemen calling themselves the "Cabinet of Science," who had issued a similar appeal and collected a similar inadequate sum, proposed a union of the two plans. Although willing to enter into the plan, the University committee made such extreme demands for control that the members of the Cabinet withdrew their offer.

The Trustees could not now, however, give up their project, and with a view to drawing in a number of interests they resolved early in 1816 to organize a "Faculty of Physical Science and Rural Economy." This title would seem to indicate that it savored rather more of practical than of the purely intellectual ideals. As finally agreed upon, it provided for four professorships, of botany, of natural history, including geology and zoölogy, of mineralogy and practical chemistry, and of comparative anatomy, including veterinary science. Agriculture and horticulture were suggested but not included. Professor Barton, of course retained the professorship of botany which he held until the year 1827. The other professorships were filled by the election of Dr. Charles Caldwell for natural history, Thomas Cooper for mineralogy and chemistry, and Thomas G. Hewson as Professor of Comparative Anatomy. The new department was considered to be parallel with the Faculties of Arts, Medicine, and Law, and it appears as such in the Catalogue of 1825 and is so described in a public address by Dr. G. B. Wood in 1826.

Arrangements were made for the use of rooms in the University buildings for lectures, and steps were taken to secure the

garden which was so essential a part of the whole scheme. Several places were considered and visited, including one in the confines of the present Fairmount Park, by the indefatigable and interested Trustees and the Professor of Botany. Finally in 1817 a tract of forty-two acres on the old Canal Road in Penn Township, in Montgomery County and twenty miles from the center of the city, was purchased for \$8,000. Professor Barton, in a new book he was preparing, announced himself as "Director of the Botanic Garden." The Trustees and the Director made occasional use as a place of resort of a building on the tract, and there were the usual complications of fencing, intruding cattle, and arrears of rent for pasturage.

Neither the garden nor the new department flourished; both lacked the fertilizer of adequate funds. As to the Faculty, the professors received no salaries, the expectation being, apparently, that they would receive financial support, as did the medical professors, from the fees of their students. But there were very few students. The only member of the Faculty who lectured regularly was Dr. Barton, and he habitually remitted his students' fees. There was one great difference between this department and the Medical School: its courses led to no profitable employment. Devotees of pure science were not numerous enough to fill classrooms, certainly not to throng them as did the medical students.

Soon the complaint was not that students did not come but that the professors did not lecture; and there were no funds to develop the distant garden. In 1819 the Trustees, discouraged, were considering its sale, but it was long held, reported regularly at a valuation of \$8,000, and was rented to a neighboring farmer for pasturing his cattle for \$100 a year. Barton and the other professors occasionally lectured, and on their successive resignation others were elected, but the Faculty of Natural Science, as a department, had no substantial existence, and in 1828 it was formally abolished. The Botanic Garden in Montgomery County was sold in 1833 to Edward S. Burd.

The project of a garden shrank to the improvement of the stretch of ground between the College and the Medical Building on Ninth Street, and the erection of a greenhouse upon it. This

was built partly by the contributions of forty-eight persons who gave \$10 apiece, and partly at the expense of Mr. Dick, the janitor, who was a person of some eminence in those days. Even these modest provisions of space and opportunity were lost in 1829 when the new buildings were erected covering nearly the same space.

The interest in botany and in other forms of pure science did not, however, cease with the abandonment of this project. Extra series and voluntary lectures on those subjects were given from time to time on the threshold of the new century. C. W. Peale had in 1798 and 1799 given two courses of lectures on natural history, and the Portuguese Consul in Philadelphia, Correa del Terra, lectured on the same subject in 1815 and 1816. In April 1820 Dr. W. P. C. Barton asked to have his course transferred to the Medical School, presumably for better fees, but the Trustees refused. He then accepted a position in the newly established Jefferson Medical School, and when in 1827 the Trustees announced that a professor in the University could not at the same time hold a position in another college, his connection with the University ceased altogether. Dr. Solomon W. Conard was Professor of Botany for many years, and Thomas Say was Professor of Natural History.

In March 1827 an act of legislature was passed freeing the University from its agreement of 1807 to establish a botanical garden, and allowing it to use the trust funds it held for that purpose, which were then \$7,239.81, for any other proper object of University expenditure.

THE MEDICAL SCHOOL
1791-1829

The Medical School and the Arts courses did not keep step; the period following the union in 1791, which was one of depression and even decline for the older department, was one of striking growth for the Medical School. The successive attacks of yellow fever from 1793 to 1804, which deprived the College teachers of their students and their income during the summer months when all well-to-do families left the city, gave occupa-

tion and experience to the medical professors. In 1793, between August 14 and November 9, there were 4,094 burials in a city of scarcely more than 50,000 inhabitants; there were 3,599 houses lying unoccupied. Ten city physicians died, one, Dr. Hutchinson, of the Medical Faculty. In 1797 of the twenty-four physicians in the city, eight died. In 1798, 3,645 people died; the next year there was a similar epidemic, and the same conditions recurred in the early years of the next century.

Dr. Rush became famous for his heroic treatment of patients, and Dr. Physick and Dr. James, both destined later to become prominent members of the University Faculty, coming home in 1793 from taking their medical degrees in Europe, found themselves immediately absorbed in the struggle with the pestilence. These attacks drew the eyes of the rest of the country on Philadelphia and on the fight its physicians were making. In response to this and to the abilities of the group of six professors, Shippen, Hutchinson, Barton, Kuhn, Rush, and Wistar, and the adjunct-professor, who made up the Faculty after the union, the number of medical students began to rise. In 1784 there were 60 students in attendance, and eight were graduated. In 1802 the lecture rooms are crowded with 125 students; in 1804 the faculty reports 150 and in 1807, 275. By 1810 there are more than 400, and after that there are seldom less than that number in attendance, never less than 350; in 1825 there are 485.

It is noticeable that the numbers attending have little relation to the numbers graduating. In the first year of the century there were but ten graduates, in 1804, out of one hundred and fifty attendants but fifteen took their degrees. Somewhat later the number of graduates began to increase, running up to sixty or eighty a year. The annual average of those graduating in the twenty years from 1809 to 1829 was eighty-eight, but the disparity with those in attendance was still as great, the average of the latter being slightly over four hundred. The number of students in the school, therefore, was almost always from four to five times as many as the graduates.

A student for a year was William Henry Harrison, later President of the United States, who in 1791 studied in the Philadelphia Medical School, under the guardianship of Robert

Morris, but left to join the army in the West before he was graduated. Since it was not until 1810 that students were required to take more than one course of lectures with each of the five professors, and then only two courses, it is evident that there were many matriculates who never came up for degrees. What was the occasion for the attendance of this horde of medical students, paying substantial fees, crowding the lecture rooms and the boarding houses of the adjacent streets, yet never trying to become physicians, needs explanation.

It is to be observed that many medical students came from the South. Out of 1,950 graduating in the first quarter of the century, almost 1,000 came from below Mason and Dixon's Line. Over and over again more students came from Virginia or even Georgia than from any northern state. Of the 132 graduates of the year 1836 more came from Virginia than from Pennsylvania, and seventy in all were Southerners. It has been calculated that of the 123 men from the state of Georgia who took the degree of M.D. in the first quarter of the century, eighty-three, about two-thirds, took them from the University of Pennsylvania. It was evidently the favorite place of medical study for Southerners. But by that time medical students were also coming from the West Indies, South America, Canada, and even Europe.

It has been suggested that a considerable number of southern planters or their sons or employes may have wished to learn enough medicine to dose their colored dependents. Other students probably came to get a smattering of medical knowledge that would enable them to set up as practitioners in backward communities with the claim that they had studied at a great medical school. A realization of this goes far to explain the efforts of the Medical Faculty in 1806, 1808, 1825, and later, to induce the Pennsylvania Legislature to pass a law against unlicensed medical practice.

As early as 1807 the Faculty called attention to the fact that, although the rules required two years' attendance, out of a class of two hundred or more not more than fifty appeared for a second year, of whom thirty were candidates for a degree. They ask whether this three-quarters of each class who come for only

one year give up the medical profession or go home and practise without a degree. They think it not unreasonable to require all those who do come to take two courses with each professor.

There is abundant testimony to the prominence, even the supremacy, of the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania. Among others Benjamin Silliman of Connecticut, preparing in 1802 to teach in the new medical school at Yale, says in his diary, "Of course I must resort to Philadelphia, which presented more advantages in science than any other place in our country"; he proceeded to attend courses there in 1802-3 and 1803-4. Dr. David Hosack, speaking before a medical society in New York in 1812, refers to the "celebrity" of the school and the honor and emolument it brings to its professors, and literary reputation to the state of Pennsylvania; he believes it has come to surpass in numbers even the University of Edinburgh. A committee of the Senate of the state, speaking of the University in a report on education March 1, 1822, says, "The merits and extensive utility of the Medical department are so well known that it would be superfluous for the committee to offer any remarks thereon. It has long been the pride of our state and country. It has flourished without a rival."¹ Thomas Jefferson wrote to Dr. Wistar in 1807. "Your medical school for anatomy and the able professors give advantages not to be found elsewhere."

All this fame and this assemblage of students meant financial prosperity for the school, or rather for the individual medical professors, who received the fees of their students directly without interposition of the University Trustees. Their position was a highly remunerative one. An English traveler in 1820 learns that the payment of one of the professors for his college duties, which only occupy his time for four months of the year, is \$6,000; another writer in 1826 estimates the average income of a medical professor at \$10,000!² A committee of the Board, anxious not to overestimate, places the average between \$5,000 and \$6,000, though for a period of eighteen years the average

¹ *Hazard's Register*, II, 307.

² *United States Gazette*, 1826.

income of the anatomical chair, always the best paid, was \$6,000 gross, or \$5,425 net.¹

To consider costs to the students, in addition to the payment for the "ticket" for each course taken, which was \$20, sold in early times by the professor himself, later by the janitor, there were fees on graduation—\$5 to each of the professors, \$4 to the Provost and \$2 to the Vice-Provost for their signatures, and \$4 to the Secretary for the preparation of the diploma. These graduation charges, calculated in 1810 at \$32.50, later at \$39 for each student, with the ordinary terrors of a professional examination, may help to explain the large numbers who never subjected themselves to either of them.

Even more substantial were the fees paid by the more ambitious students who enrolled as apprentices with one or other of the better-known professors. In 1791 Dr. Benjamin Rush wrote to John Dickinson that he has six apprentices in his "shop" and that his usual fee is £100 cash. He understands that Dr. Wistar and Dr. Griffitts will take apprentices for less than £100. He assures his correspondent that they are both professors in the University, both physicians of the Dispensary, and can be relied upon for their amiable dispositions and social standing.² It is not to be supposed that all students sought such expensive patrons. Indeed the average cost of living and of medical education for a student in Philadelphia is estimated in 1812 at about \$400 a year; the year, for medical students, was a short one.³ Somewhat later a newspaper correspondent estimates a student's yearly expenses, including tickets, boarding, books, and amusements, at \$300.⁴

A realistic letter home in 1816 from a medical student, William Irvine Wilson of Deerstown, Pennsylvania, gives in much detail the circumstances of his entry upon his studies. He has found lodging in South Fourth Street, not too far from the University, where, rooming with two others, he gets excellent board and lodging for \$5 a week, which seems to him high.

¹ Report of Committee of Trustees on the Medical Department, April 5, 1859.

² *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXV, 501.

³ *American Medical and Philosophical Register*, II, 225.

⁴ *American Daily Advertiser*, Nov. 25, 1835.

There were seven other medical students in the same boarding house. He pays \$120 for his tickets for his six courses of lectures and would like to take a ticket for the hospital and for the course of Thomas Cooper, who was spending four years of his distinguished career as Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in the College, and was already advocating a broader training in medicine. His quaint silhouette is familiar among University archives.

Wilson was much impressed with the number of his fellow students. "There are between four and five hundred students who when crowded into one room make a pretty respectable appearance." He hears five lectures every day in the morning, from five professors, Dorsey, Chapman, Physick, Coxe, and Wistar, and one in the afternoon from Dr. James. There was no regular provision for dissection in the course and, now that classes were so large, clinical teaching for only a favored few. Wilson would like to take some other courses but cannot afford them, but hopes to have money enough to get a subject for dissection. Perhaps he could not keep up the expense, for unfortunately his name is not on the list of graduates, although those of his two roommates are.¹

It may easily be imagined that the problem of room for teaching all these students was a pressing one. The old shell at Fourth and Arch could not contain them and must be broken. Among the twenty-five pieces of property confiscated from Tories at the Revolution and handed over to the University in 1785 was a fine lot at the northeast corner of Fifth and Walnut streets, fifty-two feet on Walnut and extending back two hundred and fifty feet on Fifth. It had been confiscated, along with several other properties, from the loyalist Andrew Allen. In 1792 we find Dr. Shippen and Dr. Wistar reconstructing, at the somewhat grudging expense of the Board of Trustees, an old building on this lot, the lower story for a chemical laboratory and lecture room, the upper floor for a larger lecture room. The building was long known as "Anatomy Hall" or "Surgeons' Hall" or simply the "Laboratory." Other lectures were still given at the old building, but chemistry and Dr. Ship-

¹ *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXVII, 507-8.

pen's lectures on anatomy, physiology, and midwifery were given in Anatomical Hall.

The death of Dr. Hutchinson, Professor of Chemistry, in the yellow fever epidemic of 1793 was followed by the election and almost immediate death of Dr. John Carson. It was a widespread wish that the position should be taken by Dr. Joseph Priestley, the famous English scientist, the discoverer of oxygen, the friend of Franklin and of humanity, who took refuge in America from the intolerance of England. Dr. Barton asked that his name should not be considered for fear of its interference with Priestley's election and acceptance. The latter was in fact unanimously elected November 11, 1794. But he had by this time settled at Northumberland, where he hoped another college would sometime be established, and declined, though regretfully. Dr. Woodhouse was thereupon elected. It was here that Silliman in 1802, 1803, and 1804 heard Shippen and Woodhouse lecture; he notes, however, that neither of the rooms "was equal to the dignity and importance of the Medical school . . . the lecture rooms were not capacious enough for more than one hundred or one hundred and twenty." Nevertheless Anatomy Hall was in use for many years for the chemical and anatomical lectures, and in 1811 was improved and enlarged. Silliman also attended the lectures of Rush, Barton, and Wistar, but in other rooms which were by this time occupied by the Medical School in addition to the building on Fifth Street.

The purchase of the President's House by the Trustees was followed promptly in October 1800 by a petition from the Medical Faculty explaining that they are now established in two separate buildings, the old Academy building on Fourth Street and Anatomy Hall on Fifth, and asking as a matter of greater convenience for a sufficient number of chambers in the new Ninth Street building for all their classes. This seems not to have been practicable, but by 1802 the "west bow-room in the second story" of the President's House had been fitted up for the lectures on *materia medica* and such subjects, while anatomy and chemistry were taught in the Fifth Street building. Still inconvenienced by their divided location and the

small size of the chemical laboratory and the lecture room above, they asked the Trustees in 1804 to set aside four rooms in the old Fourth Street building for their exclusive use. When this was not granted they asked the Trustees to join them in an appeal to the Legislature for a grant to put up an entirely new building for medical lectures. This appeal was sent in but, as usual, laid on the table. The next year the medical professors offer as a group to pay the Trustees \$720 a year if they will fix up adequate quarters for them, and propose to collect \$2 apiece from the students for reimbursement and themselves pay any deficit. With an abundance of means coming from fees under their own control the Medical Faculty endured with impatience the inconveniences of their location. After considerable altercation the Trustees in 1807 agreed to put up an entirely new building, or rather a separate structure attached to the main building on Ninth Street. This they did at an expense of some \$16,000, which was to be repaid on a complicated system, partly by the Medical Faculty itself, partly by direct charges on the medical students. This was the domed octagonal building that appears in the old pictures as a semi-detached south wing of the President's House. It was here that Dr. Shippen gave his last lectures and his reminiscences of his first class in anatomy forty-five years before in the little building in his father's garden. He died the next year.

It was in these negotiations that the old Faculty of the school as it had been reorganized after the Revolution—Drs. Shippen, Rush, Wistar, Woodhouse, and Barton—appears in its last activity. It was an organized body, meeting frequently, each member acting in turn for a year as Dean. Its first minute book “From 1767 to 1814” is preceded by a brief authoritative account of the foundation and earliest history of the school. At the end of 1807 Dr. Physick was added to their number; in 1809, on the death of the quaint Dr. Woodhouse, Dr. Coxe, a member of the Board of Trustees and a dubious choice, as appeared later, was elected. It may be this election that led Jefferson to write: “The College of Philadelphia has lost its character of primacy by indulging motives of favoritism and nepotism, and by con-

ferring appointments as if the professorships were entrusted to them as provisions for their friends."¹ In 1810 Dr. James was made professor of the newly separated chair of obstetrics, with Dr. Chapman as assistant. In 1811 Robert Hare was elected Professor of Natural Philosophy, but did not begin his long and distinguished career as Professor of Chemistry in the Medical School until 1819. In the meantime death had been busy; the passing, not only of Dr. Shippen in 1808 and Dr. Woodhouse in 1809, but Dr. Rush in 1813, Dr. Barton in 1815, and Dr. Wistar in 1818, dissolved the Faculty as it was in the early days. Their successors were a larger, probably an equally capable but not so picturesque a group.

From 1806 to 1815 the Board of Trustees had collected a matriculation fee of \$4 from each medical student to pay for the increased accommodation required. This averaged some \$460 a year. The students were dissatisfied with the requirement of a new matriculation fee each year, which they declared was not demanded in any other medical school. They complained also that the "tickets" for the courses cost more than in European institutions. In 1815 by a new arrangement the Medical Faculty paid \$1,200 a year as rent for their wing of the building, took over the charges to the students, and required them to pay but one matriculation fee of \$5. In 1817 the Medical Faculty induced the Trustees to spend \$8,000 on the enlargement of their hall at an increase of ten per cent of the rent. There were many complicated engagements and rearrangements between Faculty and Trustees, including, among other demands, a requirement that every newly engaged professor in the Medical School should pay \$600 as a "bonus" into the University treasury.² In 1828 the attempt to improve the old buildings for their uses was given up altogether and a determination reached to tear them down and erect a separate medical building.

So this constructive period in the history of the Medical School came to an end. Many events in that history have gone

¹ Jefferson to Joseph C. Cabell, Feb. 3, 1824.

² For a detailed description of these financial negotiations see a Report of a Committee on the Medical Department, April 5, 1859.

unmentioned: the rise of private teaching to correspond to the demands of the many students, the provision by enterprising physicians of additional courses to continue study beyond the short four or five months of the regular University course, the establishment in 1825 of the rival Jefferson Medical College, internal disputes, and the quaint custom of the "green box" for examinations, changes in requirements for the degree, the appearance of new and interesting personalities on the Faculty—all these demand a separate history of the Medical Department, rather than the few paragraphs available in this volume. This is still more manifestly true of the next period, and indeed of all the intervening time until the extent and diversification of the medical interests of the University during the last half-century have brought that department into the very forefront of attention.

Book III

THE RENAISSANCE

1829-1881



Chapter 6

THE BEGINNING OF EXPANSION

THE NEW FACULTY

If the old saw about the darkest hour being just before the dawn has any meteorological defense, some justification may be found for the changes that took place in the University in the late twenties and the thirties. After the sudden removal of the Provost and dissolution of the Faculty in 1828, a committee of the Board of Trustees on new appointments, with Nicholas Biddle as chairman, proceeded to make a wide search for candidates for the provostship. Letters to distinguished Bostonians, among others to Edward Everett and George Ticknor, brought courteous but not very helpful replies. Harvard was looking for a new president; Everett was himself a candidate for the presidency and twenty years later was elected to it; he was in doubt where Pennsylvania might find a man sufficiently able who would be willing to come. He suggested Ticknor and Cogswell, later Librarian of the Astor Library and a prominent literary personage, and also some younger New England clergymen, but doubted whether any one of them was available.

The committee then looked, had always probably intended to look, into their own circle, and nominated a member of the Board, the Rev. William H. DeLancey. It was a good choice. He was a man of thirty-one, of a distinguished New York family, personable and intelligent, a graduate of Yale, who had recently come to Philadelphia as assistant to the Rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's. He had seen enough of the University to be willing to accept only upon conditions. He wrote July 15, 1828, "I conceive the present organization of the Collegiate

Department of the University to be so extremely defective that no individual would be willing to undertake the government of it," and he proceeded to enumerate the changes he considered ought to be made. A number of these were just those reforms that Provost Beasley, the Faculty, and the more progressive members of the Board had been long urging; now, as so often occurs, after protracted withholding, on some slight additional pressure they were given with both hands. The Provost was to teach only the senior class and that in only one subject, the bulk of his time left free for general supervision. Although he would not be a member of the Board, as he had at first stipulated, he would be called into attendance and participation in its discussions whenever matters concerning the Department of Arts were under consideration. There was to be an adjunct-professor or instructor to teach the lower classes those branches of moral philosophy no longer taught by the Provost. Dr. DeLancey would have preferred that there should be no Vice-Provost to share responsibility, but the charter required such an officer and Adrain had already been elected. A whole group of matters of an educational character, including discipline, were to be left to the professors.

Professor Adrain, recently elected, was re-elected Professor of Mathematics and, as the oldest Professor in point of service, Vice-Provost.

The new Faculty was soon completed; Provost DeLancey, Vice-Provost Adrain, Dr. Samuel Brown Wylie, formerly at the head of the Academy, as Professor of the Classics, Alexander Dallas Bache, called from a professorship of Natural Science and Chemistry at West Point to a similar position at the University, and Rev. Edward Rutledge as Adjunct-Professor of Moral Science, formed a Faculty of five who, if not more learned or competent than their predecessors, had the freedom they had lacked and, through the privilege of the new Provost to attend meetings, were in closer relation with the Trustees. Clothed with the greater dignity now possessed by the office, and adding to it the impressiveness of his personal appearance, Dr. DeLancey gave to the provostship a distinction it had lacked since the time of Dr. Smith. He of course resigned from the Board

of Trustees, but his relations with his former colleagues remained more nearly on a basis of equality than had been those of his immediate predecessor; and long afterwards he returned to the Board. His anticipations and plans for the University and his appeal to the citizens of Philadelphia for their support "on the eve of its resuscitation," as he expressed it, were set forth in an inaugural address delivered when he took office as Provost in the fall of 1828, in the room set aside as the College Chapel. Both the inaugural and the chapel were old ideas of Dr. Beasley's.

The simplicity of college teaching in those days is indicated by the organization of this address. It arranges all college subjects under the four heads, ancient languages, moral philosophy, natural philosophy, and mathematics, and avers that, given a Faculty adequate to teach these, the student pursuing them with some degree of earnestness and subjection to discipline will be guaranteed preparation for the "pursuit of any professional engagement on which his eye may be fixed." College education is represented as primarily preparation for later professional studies, though its advantages "will not be thrown away" in any later career. It would be hard to find in the literature of the time a more attractive or more enlightened picture of the profit and pleasure of such an old-fashioned college course and one more gracefully and more appealingly expressed than that presented in this the first inaugural address by a Provost of the University. An echo of recent difficulties can be heard, however, in his kindly warning that "the cords of discipline are to be tightened," and in his statement that the higher disciplinary powers have been recently turned over by the Trustees to the Faculty and that they will not hesitate to separate a student from the college opportunities which he neglects, undervalues, or defies. On the other hand he assures students and their parents that the College "need not shrink from a comparison with any of her sister institutions" and that "the course of studies is as full and comprehensive as is deemed anywhere requisite for a college education," a fair enough statement, as the published curriculum shows. A final tribute to the distinction of his colleagues, the holders of the four professorships,

was also justified; they were all scholars. Nor does he fail to remind all concerned that "the venerable Franklin, the Father of American Philosophies . . . was among the founders of the collegiate institution with which we are connected."

Professor Adrain, the Vice-Provost, was a natural born mathematician. A school teacher in the north of Ireland, he had taken part there in the rebellions of the early nineteenth century and had escaped with difficulty to the land of promise. He had taught in various academies in Pennsylvania until his contributions to mathematical magazines had attracted attention and led to calls, first to Rutgers, then to Columbia, then back to Rutgers, from which he had been persuaded with some difficulty to come to Pennsylvania early in 1828. He was the most ingenious American mathematician of his time. He edited mathematical works and established a new mathematical journal. But he had no bent for administration or for the elementary teaching to which he was restrained at the University.

However good a mathematician, he was a poor disciplinarian; in his room and in halls and chapel when he was in charge, the old disorders asserted themselves. For a while his colleagues stood by him loyally, and students were from time to time suspended and even expelled for acts of misbehavior which were always in some way connected with Professor Adrain. The disorders spread to other departments. Students and their parents appealed to the Faculty and then to the Trustees against what they considered unjustified or unduly severe sentences; but the Trustees refused to intervene, and referred them back to the Faculty. At last the other members of the Faculty performed what they asserted to be a painful duty and reported to the Board of Trustees that all the difficulty lay with one of their number. Professor Adrain then resigned. From among many competitors E. H. Courtenay, Professor of Mathematics at West Point, was appointed to the resulting vacancy. As he lacked the usual academic honors the University gave him the honorary degree of M.A., but he remained only two years; his successor, Henry Vethake, remained for more than twenty years.

In Alexander Dallas Bache, the new Professor of Natural

Philosophy and Chemistry, it might seem that Franklin himself had come back. He was Franklin's great-grandson, with the other substantial Philadelphia heritage indicated by his middle name. He was an army man; he had been admitted to West Point at fifteen and graduated in engineering at nineteen—a precocious academic career for that institution. After some general army experience he returned as Assistant Professor of Engineering, and it was from there he was called to a professorship in his native city, in the fall of 1828. He taught continuously at the University for ten years and then resigned to become the first President of Girard College. He was one of the most active and distinguished men of his time; his name is prominent in the history not only of these two institutions but of the Franklin Institute, the American Philosophical Society, the United States Coast Survey, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Philadelphia public school system. He was in the service of the University again in 1843 and 1844. At the same time he was making observations in terrestrial magnetism and some other natural phenomena, much in the spirit of his great-grandfather. He wrote a number of valuable reports on educational and scientific subjects; and was besides an excellent teacher. Samuel Brown Wylie, Professor of Languages, was more the pedagogue; he was a well-trained classical scholar, promoted to the College in 1828 from the Academy, of which he had long been Principal.

A man more attractive in many ways than any of these, whose gifted mind is attested alike by tradition and his own literary remains, over whose memory a tragic death has left its shadow, was Henry Reed. He was not among the very first group appointed in 1828, but was added to the Faculty February 27, 1833. A native Philadelphian, trained in a local private school, a graduate of the College in the class of 1825, member of "Philo," son of a Trustee, connected by relationship, marriage, church, and habits with literary and refined city society, he was a typical Philadelphian of the upper class. Yet his intellectual relations and correspondence were almost entirely with men of his own interests in England. Prepared for the bar, like a well-known successor in our own time, he left the law

promptly when in 1831 a minor position was created for him in English literature at the University. For a while he was Assistant Professor of Moral Philosophy, supplementing the teaching of the Provost under the arrangement introduced in 1828, but in 1834 he became a full member of the Faculty as Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, a position to which he gave distinction for twenty years. Apart from his teaching he edited various standard works of English literature and made himself the special interpreter to the American people of the poet Wordsworth, with whom he had a long correspondence. His volumes on English history and literature, on the British poets and American history, published by his brother after his death, were special courses of popular lectures given at the University to general audiences rather than what he gave in the classroom. They must have had much the same effect in familiarizing Philadelphia with the best contemporary European literature as the appreciative literary commentaries Longfellow and Ticknor were at the same time giving to New England.

George Allen, who joined the Arts Faculty of the University only in 1845, can hardly be accounted a member of the group of professors who began giving distinction to the University at the opening of the period of revival, but he was a man so characteristic of the period, and left so strong an impress on the minds of other men in the middle of the century that he can hardly be omitted here. He was a New Englander, a Congregationalist, a graduate and for a while professor in the University of Vermont. He was a restless spirit; a student and eventually a distinguished scholar in Latin and Greek, he also studied law and was admitted to the bar, then he turned to theology and was ordained a clergyman in the Episcopal Church; soon after coming to Philadelphia, in 1847, under the general influence of the Oxford movement he became a Roman Catholic in the same year with Newman, and apparently remained in that faith the rest of his life. Throughout these intellectual and spiritual adventures he was an active writer on all the subjects brought up by them. He wrote several books on chess, following one of the many and varied interests of Franklin, and gathered a library in that field that included

about a thousand volumes. He wrote on military science and was interested in music. He was given the degree of LL.D. by the University in 1868. It was as a scholar in the classical languages, and especially in Greek, that he left his greatest impression on the University. During the thirty years of his service as Professor of Languages he was the most forceful personality in the Arts Faculty and was so much admired that his influence helped to continue the predominance of the classics in the College to that late date when they were finally forced to yield to the demands for equal attention of other subjects.

The line of professors of geology and mineralogy dates from 1835. The first of these, Henry D. Rogers, was in a position to offer his services as lecturer without salary, and the Faculty, attracted by an opportunity to expand their number without expense, petitioned the Trustees for his election.

High-water mark of this particular period of advance was soon reached. In 1830 Provost DeLancey gave a second annual address, this time in the new building, at the opening of the winter term. He was flushed with success. The number of students had risen from sixty at the opening of the fall term of 1828 to something over ninety at the corresponding time in 1829, and to one hundred and twenty-five in 1830; the Trustees passed resolutions of approval and coöperation; the problem of bad behavior seemed, if not settled, at least much improved; and there were evidences of appreciation on the part of the community. But things soon fell back. The old handicaps of a materialistic city, absence of denominational attraction, lack of community life in dormitories, had none of them been really overcome. Discipline exercised by the Faculty with a somewhat pedantic demand for absolute continuous attention and unquestioning submission was not effective. Faculty meetings were still largely devoted to the public rebuke of students for actions that might well have been overlooked. The facts were sometimes at issue, and an unfortunate number of the culprits had family connections with Trustees or influential citizens who were unwilling to accept Faculty judgment. The problems of discipline had evidently not yet been solved. They ranged from the expulsion of a South Carolina student for profane swearing in

chapel, to suspension of a Philadelphia student for having an egg in his possession, intending, it was charged, to throw it at one of the professors.

There was the same difficulty in imposing the new standards of scholarship. Students were frequently ill prepared and rebelled against the standards of thoroughness on which Dr. DeLancey and the new members of the Faculty tried to insist. Close watchfulness of their progress, application of rigorous requirements for entrance, promotion, and graduation, frequent reports to the Board of Trustees and their parents brought constant protest from the students. The professors insisted that they were requiring no more than was well within the power of the students, but new standards were incompatible with old slackness. It soon appeared that this Faculty rigidity in discipline and scholarship, under the conditions of the time, was reducing the number of students—fewer admissions and many withdrawals. Dr. DeLancey in the fall of 1832 deplored the fact that only twenty-seven new students were applying for admission where thirty-seven had applied the year before; that fourteen of last year's students had been withdrawn to be put in counting houses and offices, five had gone to other institutions, three had been dismissed for incompetency and four more were likely to be.

Since about one-half the College departments' total income was at this time derived from the fees of students, any diminution in their number affected the finances seriously, and in 1833 the Trustees found themselves again in money difficulties. For the year their expenses amounted to some \$18,000, while their income could be estimated at only \$16,000, a deficit of \$2,000. As a slight saving they decided to abolish the assistant professorship created to provide for a part of the teaching previously done by the Provost; the incumbent, Rev. Mr. Crusé, thereupon resigned and no successor was appointed. There were some alleviations. In 1832 the state Assembly passed a law exempting the real estate owned by the University in Philadelphia from county and poor taxes. November 19, 1835, a meeting of citizens of Philadelphia was called by a committee of the Trustees for the support of a general appeal to their fellow citi-

zens for an endowment fund of \$100,000 for the University. Cordial resolutions of approval were passed but we have no record of returns.

In 1833 and 1834 Dr. DeLancey had a long spell of illness which kept him away from the University for some months. He was discouraged by the cessation of the rapid advance that had shown itself in the early period of his provostship. He therefore resigned, and was re-elected a member of the Board of Trustees. The golden promise of the beginning of his administration had faded away. Five years later he was made Bishop of Western New York; he became one of the founders of Hobart College at Geneva.

Albert Gallatin, James Fenimore Cooper, and other influential New York men, as soon as they heard of Dr. DeLancey's resignation, sent letters to the Trustees recommending for the vacant provostship Dr. John Augustus Smith, formerly President of the College of William and Mary, lately of Columbia Medical School. He had just lost his position in New York because of a long and embittered political quarrel. This record of contentiousness did not appeal to the Trustees and they offered the provostship to Dr. Wayland, President of Brown University. He declined, and they then made the same offer to Dr. John Ludlow, a prominent clergyman then in charge of a church in Albany. He was a graduate of Union College, had been given two honorary degrees there, and had taught in the Theological Seminary in New Brunswick, N.J. He came to Philadelphia to meet the committee of the Board of Trustees, made a good impression, and in October 1834 was elected seventh Provost. In December he delivered an eloquent inaugural address. He was as much a preacher as a teacher; spoke repeatedly in many pulpits in Philadelphia and elsewhere and lectured widely, but in spite of the twenty years of his provostship left little personal impress on the University.

Notwithstanding the slowing up of the process of improvement that began with the late twenties, the accession of a Provost of less vigor and ambition than Dr. DeLancey, and the persistence of many old problems, the University approached the close of its first century with a better internal organization, a more

distinguished Faculty, a larger body of students, and higher hopes than in its long period of partial paralysis.

THE NEW BUILDINGS

In the matter of its buildings the hand of the University was forced by the Medical School, as it has so often been since by one or another department. The use by some of the medical professors of Anatomical Hall on Fifth Street, the grant to them of rooms in the President's House on Ninth Street in 1801, the erection of a separate building attached to it for the Medical School in 1807 and its enlargement in 1817, have already been reported. The number of the students still continued to increase. There were seldom fewer than four hundred in attendance, in 1825 there were four hundred and eighty-seven. The medical professors therefore still sought better accommodations, which their large income from fees enabled them to pay for. In 1828, therefore, at their request and on their offer to pay six per cent interest on an estimated cost of \$25,000, the Trustees agreed to erect an entirely new and adequate building detached from those already there.

In order that the College, which though less prosperous lay closer to the hearts of many, should not be outdone, the Trustees decided to go further, to raze the old President's House and attached buildings and provide for the erection of two buildings, one for the College on the Market Street side of the quadrangle, the other for the Medical School on the Chestnut Street side. They had no difficulty in convincing themselves, what was very obvious, that the President's House, even with its additions, had never been suited to its educational uses. As their spokesman declared in terms somewhat lacking in the classic simplicity he advocated, "Its spacious corridors and lofty halls were ill-adapted to the abiding place of the Muses. . . . It is now to become the site of an edifice . . . not unworthy of the classic feeling which it is its main object to instil." It was calculated that the materials from the old buildings might be made use of in the construction of the new, which made it possible to put up for the Medical

School, and consequently for its twin, a building costing much more than the \$25,000 agreed upon. The corner stone of the Medical building was laid as part of Commencement exercises, March 21, 1829, that of the College building at its Commencement, July 31. Deposited in the corner stone of the former, along with other records, including in a Masonic spirit the names of the architect, the stonemason, the master bricklayer, and master carpenter, was the statement that up to that date the Medical School had granted medical degrees to more than two thousand "gentlemen educated within its walls," who, through their dispersal and the establishment of new schools of medicine, "had made the University of Pennsylvania the Parent of Medical Science in the United States."¹ The corner stone of the College building was laid by Bishop White, of the class of 1765, more than half a century a Trustee and now eighty-two years of age. It contained much the same material as that of the Medical building, but expressed largely in Latin and necessarily with a shorter roster of graduates.

From a purely artistic point of view these two buildings were the most satisfactory of all the outward forms the University has taken. Plain, but of the classic style then dominant, the two buildings were visibly, as they were really, more fitted for their purpose than either of the former buildings, which had been makeshift at best. They had a simplicity and a unity that have been impossible of attainment in the later rapid and diversified growth. The space of ninety feet between the two buildings the Trustees planned, in the hopefulness of the time, to fill in with other structures to accommodate new departments or extensions of the University they then anticipated would soon come into being. In the meantime they ordered some new philosophical apparatus from Paris, and in the College building a laboratory was set up for chemical lectures at a cost of something over \$2,000. An address by one of the Trustees at the corner-stone laying, the congratulatory address of Provost DeLancey at his second Commencement, and a special catalogue and description of the College Department of the University, along with the address of the

¹ *Hazard's Register*, VI, 202.

Provost, all filled with belief that the University was entering a new era, were issued for general distribution, in a thousand copies, by the Board of Trustees in September 1830.

It was in the two buildings of 1829, unchanged till they were abandoned almost half a century later for West Philadelphia, that the awakening life of the new period showed itself.

APPEARANCE OF THE ALUMNI ON THE SCENE

The general spirit of advance communicated itself to the alumni—or perhaps it was initiated by them. On the afternoon of November 19, 1835, a number of former students of the College gathered in the chapel of the new building. They had come on the call of a committee of eighteen prominent alumni, members of classes from 1765 to 1834. At that and adjourned meetings an alumni association was formed, a constitution adopted, officers elected, and an orator chosen for a meeting to be held on the day before the next Commencement. The first President of the society was Bishop White, and its executive committee was made up of prominent clergymen, lawyers, and others. Professor Henry Reed of the class of 1825 was Secretary. The alumni address was given July 14, 1836, by Thomas Wharton of the class of 1807, a prominent lawyer, a soldier and writer, elected a Trustee the next year. The annals of alumni activity are then silent for fourteen years.

In 1848 the society was reorganized, or perhaps again became active. Professor Henry Reed of the class of 1825 was now President. Seizing upon the most conspicuous of the possible dates for the origin of the University, and obtaining from the Trustees permission to use College Hall, they celebrated with much éclat, on the thirteenth and fourteenth of November 1849, the centennial of the organization of the Board of Trustees in 1749. The celebration opened with a notable address by William B. Reed of the class of 1822. He was a Pennsylvanian in all his connections, though diplomatic appointments had carried him to Mexico and were to take him later to China. His legal career made him District Attorney of the city and Attorney-General of the state. At present he was an active practising lawyer in Phila-

adelphia. He was grandson of the Joseph Reed who, although an M.A. of the old colonial College, had been instrumental as President of the Executive Council of Pennsylvania in transferring the powers conferred by its charter from the old Trustees to the new University of the State. He was an older brother of Professor Henry Reed and like him a man of literary interests, habits, and connections. His address therefore was "as the wounds of a friend" and "precious." Ten years before, in an address before "Philo," Mr. Reed had appealed for a deeper interest in American history, and had illustrated his appeal by a brilliant interpretation of the early steps of the Revolution. He represented a liberal and progressive spirit among the alumni in the community that was now knocking at the door of the none too responsive Board of Trustees. His address deserves therefore a somewhat detailed analysis.

He took as his text that one of Franklin's rather infrequent outbursts of sentiment called forth when, returning in 1785 from his long exile in England and France, his vessel rounded Gloucester Point, "and then we saw Dear Philadelphia." Reed acknowledges that among Philadelphians "detraction or at least disparagement of one another hangs over us like a dark and chilly vapor." His wish is, that of many a later speaker before the alumni, "to arouse a new, bolder and more mutually generous spirit of pride in ourselves, in our institutions, and in no one more so than in this now ancient seat of learning whose first century of existence has today expired, within whose walls we gained, with all its imperfections, our college training." He is able to find great names among its graduates, and he pays them due honor; but he hastens on to an appeal for the University's immediate future, for a law school, for a school of engineering and practical science, for a professorship of American history. The last desideratum was made none the less apposite by the fact that Henry Clay was an interested listener in his audience. It was a repetition of his argument of ten years before. He closes with old-fashioned eloquence:

My appeal has been for Philadelphia, "dear Philadelphia." It is an appeal which I hope may reach the ancient heart of this University, the guardian after all of high education amongst us. It and its kindred

institutions hereabouts ought to feel they are fit for something more than respectable decrepitude. There ought to be immortal youth always coursing in its veins, though a century's snows are upon its brow.

Much the same note of growth and progress was struck the next night when an alumni dinner was held at one of the city's hotels. Its organizers were able to get together a goodly group: Provost and Faculty; the oldest living graduate, Thomas Biddle of the class of 1791; the most distinguished living graduate, Robert J. Walker of the class of 1819, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; Judges and Philadelphia lawyers galore, bishops and other clergymen, physicians of standing, prominent citizens. Reminiscence of course bulked large in the thirty-two toasts and the replies to them. But some looked to the future: "Our Alma Mater, may each succeeding century of her existence add to her fame and increase the number of children of whom she need not be ashamed"; "The Trustees of the University, may they remember the Greek orators' precept, 'action, action, action'"; "The future Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, may she . . . become as eminent in her peculiar branch as the Medical Department has long since been." This last toast was offered by John B. Gest, a young graduate of the class of 1844, who became a member of the first class in the Law School, a Trustee, and whose name through his sons adorns the annals of the University for two generations.

The next few years saw a vigorous response to these appeals or to the spirit which they represented. A rapidly flowing current brought the final establishment of the long-delayed Law School and the beginnings of a scientific school, the introduction of two new degrees, Bachelor of Laws and Bachelor of Science, and the inauguration if not the permanent establishment of professorships of American history and the modern languages. The course in Arts was reorganized in 1849, and a complete transformation was proposed in 1852 and discussed with animation till 1856; in 1854 the erection of an observatory was proposed, and in the same year was founded the University Barge Club.

This trend toward expansion was characteristic of American college life in the middle of the century. At Union, at Brown, at

Harvard, at Yale, at Pittsburgh, alumni activity, faculty reorganization, and the undertaking of new ventures were the order of the day. President Wayland of Brown issued in 1842 his *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, which advocated the elective system in American colleges. Harvard's Alumni Society was formed in 1842, the Lawrence Scientific School was established in 1847; and she gave her first B.S. degree in 1851. Corresponding developments took place elsewhere.

It will be a large part of the task of this volume in the record of the second century of Pennsylvania's history to describe the establishment of one new department after another. It will not be possible, unfortunately, to follow the later development of each. Once established, its later career must be considered to have been merged in the general life of the University, to be mentioned only when it is characteristic of that general life. If occasionally the narrative of the establishment of some department carries its history somewhat further, so much the better for the department. Each school should eventually have its own history written. This is a history of the University as a whole. There are always numberless divergent paths through a wilderness. This book follows the main trail.¹

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LAW SCHOOL

The Law School of the University of Pennsylvania had its roots deep in eighteenth-century soil. The short history of its early days has already been told. Born, doubtless prematurely, in 1790, it was, like the Medical School, the first in America, unless Jefferson's proposed professorship of law and police at William and Mary be considered to have preceded it. But it did not, like the Medical School, "fill a long-felt want." It was still quite possible for a young man to become a lawyer, even a famous lawyer, by unaided study supplemented by practice in drawing up legal forms as an apprentice in an older lawyer's office. His training might well be broadened by reading, listening to legal proceedings, hearing occasional lectures on legal subjects, and the use of

¹ Much material concerning the separate departments will be found in *The University of Pennsylvania Today*, Cornell M. Dowlin, ed. Phila., 1940.

his native intellectual powers. The older lawyers generally approved of this system, charged fees to those who entered their offices, valued the free aid furnished by apprentices and found their unremunerated service as copyists convenient. The practising attorney frequently, when he had time, prescribed reading and discussed actual cases with his pupils, and to those in whom he was interested gave invaluable aid and advice. The well-established conservatism of the law operated here as elsewhere. Therefore, although catalogues of the University subsequent to 1791 stated at various times that it included a Law School as well as a Department of Arts and a Medical School, after that year the third department existed in name only, without teachers or scholars.

On the other hand there were ambitious students and enlightened practitioners who felt the lack of systematic training in the law, and urged the University to provide it. Therefore in the second decade of the nineteenth century the Law School became again for a time a reality; a brilliant lawyer of the city, son of Robert Hare the friend of Franklin, and brother of Robert Hare the chemist, was elected March 20, 1817. He announced a series of three courses to be given in successive years. They were intended rather to present the philosophy of the law than to provide legal information and training, such as were the lectures given to the medical students, which were of direct use in their practice. The three courses announced were, first, "natural jurisprudence, second, international law, third, constitutional law of the United States and Pennsylvania, with a comparative study of these and the English common law." Unfortunately, after the first course had been given, in the winter of 1817-18, Professor Hare became ill, ultimately losing his mind, and the professorship again remained vacant.

In 1832 the Philadelphia Law Association sent to the Board of Trustees a vigorously worded petition for the appointment of a professor of law, comparing the University unfavorably in this respect with Harvard, Yale, and the University of Virginia, all of which now provided facilities for the study of the law which Pennsylvania no longer offered, though she had been first in the field. Philadelphia, the petition noted, was famous, or

had been, for her judges and lawyers, and was the seat of many courts. In response to the possible objection that a young lawyer could not learn his profession from lectures it was pointed out that Blackstone was a professor in a university and his *Commentaries* were lectures to students. To the objection that established lawyers might lose their fees from student apprentices and could no longer get their formal papers copied without cost, it was answered that there was no expectation of making a law school take the place of apprenticeship.

No action was taken on this petition, and it remained for Mr. Reed in his address of 1849 to repeat the same appeal. He speaks of the difficulty of carrying on the study of law in "the din and distraction of a practising lawyer's office," and makes merry over the picture, no doubt a reminiscent one, of young law students, after they are through running errands and copying legal papers, sitting with their feet on the table in the front room of the office exchanging the gossip of the day. He thinks they may as well spend their time in listening to a lecture that will suggest to them that the law they are trying to master is a science.

The old lethargy was at last overcome. This appeal brought results, and a committee of the Board which was at the time occupied with the possibility of introducing new courses into the University recommended that the old professorship of law be revived. This was done April 2, 1850, by the election to this office of Hon. George Sharswood of the class of 1828, a Judge of the Philadelphia District Court. In the fall began the series of law courses which have "broadened down from precedent to precedent" till they have developed into the great Law School, housed in its noble building, which is now so distinguished a part of the University.

Professor Sharswood began giving courses on much more practical lines than those of his predecessors, devoting the first course to institutions of the law of Pennsylvania. There were two classes for beginners, each meeting twice a week, using Blackstone and Kent as textbooks, with formal lectures, informal recitations, and occasional moot courts. Before the second year was over the usefulness and popularity of the system were so manifest that on

May 4, 1852, a complete Law Faculty was established. It consisted of three professors, respectively of the institutes of law; practice, pleading and evidence; and the law of real estate. Judge Sharswood, who held the first of these professorships, became Dean of the Faculty; Peter McCall was elected to the professorship of practice and E. Spencer Miller to that of real estate, to which the study of equity was attached.

The degree of Bachelor of Laws was given at Commencement in 1852 to some thirty men, some of them already members of the bar, who had attended the first course of lectures of Judge Sharswood. Afterwards the degree was given only to students who attended and passed examinations in the lectures of all three professors for two years. Certificates of proficiency were offered to those who attended a smaller number of courses. The law courses, notwithstanding their known difficulty, were popular with the students from the beginning, though some of the older lawyers and the courts looked at the school somewhat askance. The District Court, the Courts of Common Pleas, and the State Supreme Court gave but slight and grudging recognition to the value of the Law School degrees and certificates in their regulations for admission to practice. They long required registry with a regular office preceptor much as the Medical Faculty did with its students. This requirement, however, gradually faded away.

The Law School never had a large number of students, due no doubt to the lack of absorptive power of the profession. It seldom during the early years had more than thirty enrolled. The average yearly number of graduates from its beginning to 1881 was fifteen. By 1861, however, the graduates felt themselves numerous enough to establish an alumni society of their own, and they have always shown a corporate unity as a group perhaps stronger than any other department.

As to location the Law School was long a peripatetic body. The lectures of Judge Sharswood were given in College Hall on Ninth Street, but as the lectures on law became a school rather than a single professorship, the department occupied two successive sets of rented rooms. At one time, in 1867, the Faculty asked to be allowed to establish themselves in the old building belonging to the University on Fifth Street above Walnut, for-

merly known as Surgeons' Hall and used for medical teaching, now in the midst of lawyers' offices, but this was refused by the Trustees. To pass for the moment beyond the limits of this chapter, after the University moved to West Philadelphia the Law School occupied for a time the large room on the third floor of the new College Hall. Once more it moved to rented rooms, now on the sixth floor of the Girard Building at Broad and Chestnut streets, and again for a while to the vacated old county court rooms at Fifth and Chestnut, before finally settling in its own dignified building.

This migratory habit was due in large part to an almost unavoidable divergence between two tendencies, one which drew the school toward the courts and ordinary practice in law offices, the other which drew it to the University as a center. This divergence was reflected in the attitudes of successive professors: P. Pemberton Morris, J. I. Clarke Hare, E. Coppée Mitchell, James Parsons, George Fisher Bispham, and C. Stuart Patterson—a small and distinguished group; the nature of the Law School work has never required a large faculty. All of these continued their practice of the law after their election to their professorships, in fact were chosen largely because of their eminence in actual practice. Ultimately the Law School, under professors who gave themselves up to the task of instruction, became much more clearly an integral part of the University.

THE SECOND SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL

The attempt to establish a school of pure science in 1816 had been abandoned in 1828 and left only a tradition of such an interest embodied in a series of capable but unappreciated appointees who held almost sinecure professorships. The names of these men do not appear on the Treasurer's books because they drew no salary, nor on the Faculty minutes because they were not members of any Faculty. Their positions were honorary and their lecture courses mostly voluntary. Such were Thomas Say, Solomon W. Conard, Professor of Botany, and others.

But there was another sense of the term "Science," in which it meant a kind of education by which a young man was prepared

to make a living. A recognition of utilitarian values is by no means foreign to the Philadelphia spirit, which has never undervalued the practical or the materially profitable. The main question was whether science in this sense could be brought within the bounds of University teaching. Were there students willing to pay for systematic instruction in the mechanical professions? If so, there might well be introduced into the University a fourth school, analogous to Arts, Medicine, and Law. Science in this sense may be said to have entered the University with the election in 1851 of James C. Booth as "Professor of Chemistry as applied to the Arts." Professor Booth was a highly educated man and a thoroughly trained chemist. He was graduated A.B. at Pennsylvania in 1829 and studied for some years in Germany, probably the first American to go to Germany to study chemistry. On his return to Philadelphia in 1836 he had established a sort of student laboratory where he gave instruction and supervised the work of a number of students and at the same time carried on assays and other commercial work. He was also smelter and refiner of the United States mint, wrote and published various chemical works and gave lectures at the Franklin Institute and at the Philadelphia High School in its early days, in addition to his almost nominal connection with the University.

At the University at the same time was John F. Frazer of the class of 1830, who had been appointed Professor of Natural History and Chemistry in the College to succeed his old preceptor, Alexander Dallas Bache, in 1844. It will be observed that the men whose names must be mentioned in connection with the establishment of these early courses in science at the University, as so often happens in the history of new departments, were men of marked individuality. Professor Frazer was son of a graduate of the class of 1789, and grandson of General Persifor Frazer of Revolutionary fame. Although he specialized in chemistry, he had studied both medicine and law and was in fact admitted to the bar. He was editor of the *Journal of the Franklin Institute* for many years, and was one of the rather remarkable group of young scholars who became teachers at the Philadelphia High School at its origin. He was appointed to a scientific professorship at the University in 1844; yet he retained his old taste for

the classics, kept up with modern French literature, and entertained at his home artists, literary Americans, and foreigners. He received the degree of LL.D. from Harvard in 1857.

In a letter to J. R. Ingersoll, one of the most active and interested of the Board of Trustees, Professor Frazer suggested an extension and development of such practical scientific courses as Professor Booth and he were prepared to give. His proposal led to the establishment by vote of the Trustees in June 1852 of a School of Mines, Arts and Manufactures, and in the election of J. W. Alexander of Baltimore as Professor of Engineering and Mining, and Charles B. Trego as Professor of Geology. The next year three assistants were provided in chemistry. All these appointees were to serve without salary, receiving only such remuneration as should come from the fees of their students.

This project was forwarded by sympathetic resolutions adopted by the American Iron Association, an enlightened industrial organization just then meeting in Philadelphia. Their resolutions, sent to the Trustees, expressed strong approval of the announced intention of opening a school of the practical arts and mines and promised it their hearty support. They declared it was one of the objects of the Association to encourage all efforts "to give the young iron-master a proper and scientific training preparatory to his engaging in practical operations." So often has the possibility of creating a strong school of mines come within the orbit of the University, and so obvious is the interest of the state of Pennsylvania in its mineral resources that it remains a constant source of wonder that she did not then nor has she at any time before or since established such a department on a strong basis. The group of professors appointed in 1852 took as little interest in their unpaid services as had those in the School of Natural Science twenty-five years before. So 1853 and 1854 passed away with no evidence of activity on their part. The communication from the Iron Association, however, led the committee of the Trustees on the new school to demand that the professors in these scientific subjects either begin teaching or resign. Professor Alexander and Professor Booth resigned, the former October 16, 1855, the latter February 5, 1856. Professor Trego chose to remain.

Fairman Rogers, a young graduate of the class of 1853, was elected in the place of Professor Alexander, with the new and portentous title, "Professor of Civil Engineering, Geology, Mining, Surveying, Art of Mining and Mining Machinery." His career had somewhat the same variety and comprehensiveness as his title, for he occupied himself with subjects as far apart as magnetism and polo, and held prominent membership in societies as different as the American Philosophical Society and the Philadelphia Coaching Club. Of the latter he was the founder. He was also a well-known and daring rider to hounds. He was an officer in the Civil War and later a Trustee of the University. He was already, when elected to the University, a lecturer on civil engineering at the Franklin Institute.

His piece of writing that especially interests the present historian is the minute book and somewhat pathetic record of the Department of Mines, Arts and Manufactures from its reorganization under his deanship in 1855 to its suspension in the confusions of the Civil War in 1861, all written by his own hand, accompanied with financial statements and illustrated with plans and printed materials in a way to delight the heart of any chronicler. Professor Rogers gave his first course of twenty-eight lectures in civil engineering, for which he printed a syllabus, in the winter of 1855-56. He lectured three times a week, at first at one in the afternoon, afterward from four to six, the late afternoon becoming the regular teaching period of this department, presumably because other work for the day was over. He had five pupils. In the fall of 1856 the department was reorganized, or rather organized for the first time, with a Dean and regular Faculty meetings. To the three professors, Frazer, Rogers, and Trego, respectively of mechanics and chemistry, of civil engineering, and of geology and mineralogy, was added a Professor of Applied Mathematics, "Old Kendall," then very young Kendall, previously a teacher in the High School, afterwards the object of affection to at least two generations of University students and colleagues.

In the first year of the school, 1856-57, the four professors gave lectures, each twice a week, to twenty-two students, each receiving net emoluments ranging from \$37.50, the share of

Professor Kendall, to \$62.50 each, received by Professors Rogers and Trego. So the school continued with numbers between one and two score each year. Attendance was purely voluntary; any course might be taken; there were no requirements for entrance or pressure to take instruction in ordinary college subjects. Students who had completed any subject and had passed an examination were entitled to a diploma or certificate in that subject, but not to a degree. The charge for each course was five dollars, or all four might be taken for fifteen dollars. Tickets for the course were bought, like those for the medical courses, from the janitor, who collected a substantial sum for his business enterprise.

In 1859 J. Peter Lesley of the class of 1838 was elected Professor of Mining, and relieved Professor Rogers of at least one of his subjects. The career of Professor Lesley had certainly not lacked variety in the past, nor was it to be in future the monotonous one usually ascribed to the college professor. A graduate of the University in 1838, he studied and graduated in theology at Princeton in 1844, spent a year in scientific study at Halle in Germany, acted as colporteur for the American Tract Society in the backward parts of Pennsylvania for two years, and as pastor of a Congregational church in New England for three. Among his early activities he had been Assistant State Geologist of Pennsylvania, and in 1851 he resumed pursuit of that subject. Among a score of books on geological subjects he took time to write one on *Man's Origin and Destiny*. He became in 1859, as has been said, Professor of Mining at the University, and for more than forty years, down to within the memory of men now living, he was a conspicuous figure in local, national, and foreign scientific societies and in various capacities at the University. He was given the degree of LL.D. by Trinity College, Dublin, in 1878.

There is no reason to doubt the excellence of the training given by the School of Mines, Arts and Manufactures; there were no difficulties of attendance or discipline and the costs were certainly not high; but the students remained few. The labor of the professors was largely a labor of love, and their living, except for the two who were wealthy, had to be made in other ways

concurrently with their teaching. Nevertheless, early in 1861 an optimistic announcement of the next year's courses was published; a favorable comparison was made of the opportunities at Pennsylvania with those at other engineering schools in this country and even in Europe. But the promises could not be fulfilled; there were other calls made on industrial ability and training. The curtain of war fell on the scene, and this particular University play was swept from the stage. The activities of the school were suspended for twelve years, and when they were resumed it was in so different a form and in such different surroundings that their description may fairly be left to the later period.

HISTORY AND ENGLISH

It will be remembered that among his criticisms and proposals of new subjects of teaching in his alumni address of 1849 Mr. W. B. Reed had referred to what he considered the University's neglect of history, especially American history.

Ignorance of History, deep, dark ignorance of our own history is the crying intellectual defect of our country, and especially so of this community . . . American history has students and teachers and patrons in New England—why not in Pennsylvania? In Pennsylvania, one page of whose Revolutionary history has more interest in all that should warm an American heart, than volumes of New England!

A year later the Trustees responded to this outburst of national and local patriotism by electing Mr. Reed himself Professor of American History, with the understanding that he give half his time to lectures on the subject and that he should serve without salary. For the next five years history had an unwonted prominence in the curriculum. Either given by him or by his brother, Professor Henry Reed, courses appear on history or constitutional or international law in each of the four years of the curriculum. In 1856 Mr. W. B. Reed was appointed United States Minister to China and his teaching came suddenly and permanently to an end.

It was thirty years from the suspension of Mr. Reed's course be-

fore American history was again taken up as a separate branch of teaching. Other forms of history fared hardly better, but literature, of which history was often considered only a form, remained a subject of constant interest. Both subjects suffered a grievous loss in the tragic death of Henry Reed. His influence had been deep and beneficial for more than twenty years. He was one of the few University teachers whose public lectures in Philadelphia drew large and interested audiences.

It is a pleasure to record his enjoyment of his last literary adventure, notwithstanding its sad close. Disappointed at not receiving the appointment of the professorship of Moral Philosophy made vacant by the resignation of Provost Ludlow in 1853, to which he thought he had valid claims, and which traditionally carried with it the provostship, he obtained in 1854 leave of absence for the journey to Europe he had long planned. The greater part of this summer he spent in England, and nothing could have exceeded the friendliness shown him, the interest of the group of intellectual people with whom he was thrown, and all that simple, warm-hearted kindness English people can offer to those with whom they discern some internal bond of natural cohesion. Wordsworth, the poet whose works he had edited for the first time in America, and had popularized in his writing, lecturing, and teaching, with whom he had corresponded intimately for eighteen years, was now dead; but in the households of his widow, his son, and other relatives and friends Reed and his sister-in-law, who accompanied him, were frequent and welcome guests. The portrait of the poet, which Reed engaged Inman to paint, and the accompanying sketch of the poet's home at Rydal Mount still hang in the room of one of his successors at the University.

On September 20, 1854, Professor Reed and his sister-in-law sailed from Southampton for home; seven days later their vessel, the steamship *Arctic*, collided with another ship in the fog and, along with some two hundred others, they were lost. The mourning for him at the University and in Philadelphia was prolonged and sincere. His brother provided, during the next two or three years, for the publication of five volumes of his lectures on Eng-

lish literature and English and American history; some others were published later and there are still some unpublished manuscript writings by him in the University Library.

Occasion was taken on Professor Reed's death by some members of the Faculty and Trustees who wished to see still more attention paid to the classics in the curriculum to propose the suppression of the chair of English literature, giving part of the salary attached to it to an additional teacher of Latin and Greek and dividing the work in English among two or more other members of the Faculty. There was much discussion and many successive reports during the years 1854 and 1855, too detailed to discuss here, but the final result was the retention of the English chair and the appearance on the scene of Francis A. Jackson of the class of 1848 as Professor of Greek and Latin, afterwards of Latin alone, for many years the most influential though not perhaps the most popular member of the College Faculty.

For the successor of Professor Reed the University turned, as it so often did in this period, to the government academies. At Annapolis it found Henry Coppée, graduate of West Point, a soldier, an engineer, a student, and now a teacher of English. He was elected May 4, 1855, and received the title that had become well established under Reed, Professor of Belles Lettres and English Literature. He carried the curious combination of literary and military interests and writings through the Civil War, until he resigned in 1866 to become the first President of Lehigh University. Here he combined literature with engineering and added to them the teaching of international law and the philosophy of history.

BISHOP POTTER'S PLAN

In the midst of all the discussion of law and science and re-organization of the Faculty that marked the early years of our second century, one of the Trustees, Bishop Alonzo Potter, threw a bomb into the camp by bringing before the Board a proposal for the transformation of the University into a postgraduate school—a "free University," as he called it. He explained later that he meant it to be superimposed upon the existing Univer-

sity much as this had been originally superimposed upon the Academy; but in all the discussion it was taken for granted that this new postgraduate department should predominate. Bishop Potter had been, before his election to ecclesiastical office, for twenty years Professor of Mathematics and Natural Theology and later of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy at Union, and still later was President of Geneva College, New York. He was therefore primarily a college man and had an unusually deep interest in advanced education.

At the first session of the American Association for the Advancement of Education, of which he was President, held at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1851, he had expressed dissatisfaction with the existing condition of college education in this country and appealed to "the inquiring and manly habit of mind" which he conceded had been developed by it in America, to seek for its further improvement. As to the University of Pennsylvania, he became convinced after he had been a Trustee eight years that it was unfavorably situated for attracting any large number of students to its College department, since Philadelphia had many good private schools which gave much the same training in the classics as did the University; it had a newly established high school which also gave the degree of A.B., and was surrounded by colleges to which many parents, influenced by personal or religious attachment, sent their sons. In 1854, the year in which his proposal was made, there were fourteen Philadelphia boys at Princeton, and out of 443 students enrolled in four outside colleges, forty-two were from Philadelphia. Under these circumstances and with what he believed to be a decreasing demand for collegiate education throughout the United States as a whole, it was not to be anticipated that the number of students in Arts at the University would increase much beyond the eighty to a hundred which had been the average number of students for the last thirty years. At one time it is true it had risen to 125, but in 1854 it was but eighty.

He was a loyal Trustee, for he remarks that "there is nothing to distinguish our institution from one hundred and thirty or forty others save that we teach better than most of them, a comparison of which few will know, fewer still acknowledge and

very few appreciate." So long as this is so, "we shall continue to be what most of the one hundred and thirty or forty undeniably are, i. e., small in numbers and limited in influence." He therefore proposes that Pennsylvania shall offer something entirely new and distinctive: an opportunity for those who have already passed through their college years, or who have ambitions and qualifications, and "a strong bent toward specific studies"—young men presumably from twenty to twenty-five years of age—"to pursue these studies much further than any college now takes them. . . . I have a deep conviction that we need the open university, where young men, older and better trained than our ordinary collegians, with more active desire for improvement can be sent." There was at present room for only one such institution in the United States; there were rumors of such a university being established at Albany under the aegis of the state of New York. "At Albany, or at Philadelphia? It seems to me that the ashes of Franklin would hardly sleep if we suffered Albany to have the honor and happiness of such an establishment."

This sagacious and far-reaching but somewhat inchoate plan for establishing such a graduate school laid by him before the Board of Trustees was accompanied with a proposed by-law providing for its introduction. It was referred, as usual, to a committee, but with the additional proviso that it be printed and communicated to the members of the Faculty with a request for an expression of their opinion. There was no Provost at the time, but all members of the Faculty—Reed, Vethake,¹ Allen, Frazer—gave written opinions, subsequently printed, often of considerable length, which with the possible exception of the Professor of Chemistry, were strongly adverse to the proposition. There was in these opinions much misunderstanding of the proposal and unfortunately a tone of unnecessary hostility, academic claims of superiority, and occasionally quite misplaced sarcasm, along, of course, with evidences of a very real perception of the difficulties and involvements of such a transformation.

This was not a case of conflict between Trustees and Faculty; we have little record of the views of the former on the proposal, but it is evident that the Faculty were beyond their depth. They

¹ Vice Provost, 1845-1854. Provost, 1854-1859.

were primarily teachers, each with knowledge of the secondary sources for his subject and most of them familiar with the classics; they had little conception of that investigative spirit, that dealing with the products of research that marks the attitude of both professors and students in a graduate school. This was a general characteristic of all American educational institutions. Twenty years later many of the best men from the best American universities have recorded their delight and exhilaration when in Europe they came in contact for the first time with men who drew their own knowledge from its raw materials; in America investigation existed, generally speaking, only in the natural sciences.

Nettled at the tone of the professors' replies and convinced of the fact that they were standing in their own light and in opposition to the best interests of the University by their narrow view and unresponsive attitude, Bishop Potter answered, in a second letter, written between eight and nine months after the first, the misapprehensions concerning the proposed plan, defended his fundamental position, and justified many of his original statements from a much wider knowledge of educational conditions than that of his critics. He asserted further that there existed at the time in the United States "a great and rapidly growing class of young men, not graduates, who are active, ingenious, aspiring, the offspring of our improved public schools, of our indefatigable press, of our industrial emergence and of our free institutions." He expressed freely and somewhat fantastically his resentment at the depreciatory tone of the academic references to them. "The alliance between science and industry, one of the more notable facts of our time, is ignored among the sybarites of a cloistered literature who would scourge back to mindless drudgery or random adventure those whose lot indeed may be labor, but who hunger and thirst for knowledge with an appetite which rebukes many a child of affluence." It might seem that the Bishop had some prevision of the Wharton School, schools of architecture and education and biology and engineering, and all such opportunities as a new nation and a new age, thrilling with life, might still demand. He had evidently a new type of student in mind, as well as those of the old type who

wished to carry their education further. But it is hard to recognize the old Faculty as "sybarites of a cloistered literature." Discouraged by "the disfavor with which the proposition is regarded by those whose cordial coöperation would be essential to its success," Bishop Potter dropped the plan. In the Board of Trustees appointment after appointment was made for a report from the committee when there might be a full and free discussion of the proposal. But each time the matter was postponed, till the whole subject seems to have been forgotten. And so we were again the first to consider a great step forward, the foundation of an organized graduate school in the United States, but for want of imagination, boldness of conception, or financial support, lost the opportunity. Just thirty years later the idea was taken up again and the Graduate School founded.

As a matter of fact a little group of undergraduate students were engaged at this time in a project, if not of research yet of equal dignity with most advanced study. This was the reproduction of the Rosetta Stone published by a committee of the Philomathean Society. A member procured and presented to the Society in 1856 a plaster cast of the well-known monument in the British Museum with its trilingual inscription in Hieroglyphics, Demotic, and Greek. It had lately attracted much attention and been described and translated by the French scholar Champollion. A little group of interested members of "Philo," Henry Morton, afterward President of Stevens Institute of Technology, then a junior, Charles R. Hale, a sophomore, and Huntingdon Jones of '57, then Moderator, had themselves appointed a committee to report upon it. With what one of them afterwards called "the happy temerity of youth and inexperience," and feeling "that nothing possible to man ought to trouble a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and of the Philomathean Society," by the time they had graduated, two years later, they had produced the report in two successive editions, in book form. Printed in colors by a lithographic process, with appropriate illustration and ornament, it gave a textual reproduction of the inscription in its three languages, collated with

¹ An interesting account of early graduate schools is, W. C. Ryan, *Studies in Early Graduate Education*. Pub. by the Carnegie Foundation, N.Y., 1939.

the Lepsius text of the corresponding inscription on the wall of the temple at Philae.

It was a work of genuine scholarship, of ingenuity, boldness, industry, and good taste. It drew a complimentary letter from Baron von Humboldt, who was doubtless unaware of the youth and lack of training, as he was certainly unfamiliar with American learning, of the producers of what he calls "the first essay at independent investigation offered by the *littérateurs* of the New Continent." The two editions of the Report were soon exhausted and have long since become rarities sought for by librarians.

THE CIVIL WAR

Fort Sumter was fired on, April 12, 1861, and educational activities were again interrupted by war, as they had been at the time of the Revolution. The proximity of Philadelphia to the South brought the conflict close home to her people and institutions. Almost immediately, in September 1862, the Trustees in accordance with the state law instructed the Faculty of the departments of Arts and Science to form the students into a military organization; no student, however, was to be forced to join against the wishes of his parents or against his own conscience.

The state government, in the law for creating a loan and for arming the state, had authorized any incorporated educational institution "to establish a military professorship for the educating of young men in military discipline and the art of war." This meant little change at the University, for a director of military training was ready to their hand in Henry Coppée, Professor of English Literature. It will be remembered that he had graduated at West Point, seen service in Mexico, and taught at the Naval Academy. Notwithstanding his Southern birth he was an enthusiastic supporter of the national cause. However, a department of military science was formally established.

As the students of Arts at that time were scarcely more than fourteen or fifteen when they entered, and eighteen or nineteen when they were graduated, they could be little more than a cadet corps. Nevertheless they were regularly organized, with

captains selected from the senior class. These were successively through three years Chester D. Hartranft '61, later captain of a militia regiment, Richard S. Hayes '64, and William W. Montgomery '65. They were above the average age of students, Hartranft being twenty, Hayes nineteen, and Montgomery twenty in the years of their captaincy. At first the corps was known as the University Light Infantry, then, after 1864, when they had been provided with six cannon, as the Pennsylvania Light Artillery. They were given the old hall at Fourth and Arch streets as an armory, and the bricked open space in front of the building as a drill ground, the "College Yard" in which, almost a century before, their predecessors, the troops of the Revolutionary army, had gathered and so much disturbed the college exercises of that time. They marched also to various parts of the city for exercise, training, and show. At first they had "ugly yellowish-gray" cadet cloth uniforms, but in 1864 they were given the dark blue uniforms trimmed with red provided by the state, and standard arms and equipment. They were given a silk standard of the state and national colors by the ladies of Philadelphia. Several members of the Faculty besides Professor Coppée were particularly interested in military affairs, and Professor Allen and Professor Jackson took special pains to call the attention of the students to passages in their Greek and Roman authors descriptive of military events.

No attempt was made to organize the medical and law students. Their greater age made it proper that they should act on their own initiative. Besides, the large number of Southern students in the Medical School made it probable that there would be, as actually occurred, a large defection to join the Southern armies. A member of the class of '63 remembers how a hot-headed, excitable classmate from Georgia on the day the news of the attack on Fort Sumter came, shouted, "I am going to leave for home at once to fight for my own state and to have it out with you fellows!" His name was Bullock, and as a matter of fact he served in the Confederate navy and was lieutenant on the *Alabama* when she was destroyed by the *Kearsarge* off Cherbourg.

Those students who left college to join the actual forces on

one side or the other were more important than the local undergraduate corps. On August 5, 1862, when it had become evident that more and more recruits would be required, and the first draft law had been passed, the Trustees made enlistment easy by promising that undergraduates who should volunteer "to serve their country in her present noble efforts to crush a wicked rebellion," and those who were drafted, might graduate with their classes if they were not absent for more than a year from the University and could get the approval of the Faculty. Many did so. Names familiar in later national, state, or University history appear as serving for a longer or shorter period on these conditions. After the calamitous campaign of 1862, when in 1863 Pennsylvania itself was invaded and the Battle of Gettysburg was imminent, Philadelphia was almost in a panic. Earthworks were thrown up to the south and west of the city. They lay just outside the present botanical grounds and veterinary hospital. Many families left the city. It became doubtful whether a Commencement should be held in 1863. However, it was decided to go on, and the usual degrees were bestowed on twenty-one candidates on the third of July while the guns of Gettysburg could almost be heard. The program explains the absence of one of the appointed speakers, George Strawbridge, by the annotation "Excused,—gone for defense of the State." Another, James W. Ashton, on leave from the army for the day, gives his oration in an old scholar's gown borrowed from the Rev. Phillips Brooks, over the uniform of a lieutenant in the service of the United States. Another, William Brooke Rawle, recently enlisted in the Third Pennsylvania Cavalry, unknown to classmates and Faculty, was taking part in the cavalry charges at Gettysburg and speculating whether he was "an idiot for permitting myself to be just where I was" while his classmates were peacefully receiving their degrees, or whether he "would rather give up half his lifetime than to have missed having a hand in it."

In 1865 some students petitioned the Trustees to make military training compulsory, but the sad accident to two of the students on April 22, 1865, when they were discharging a cannon in Penn Square, as a salute at the funeral services of President Lincoln, turned discussion to the expediency of discontinuing

military training altogether. This was the more natural because of the departure of Professor Coppée that year to take the presidency of Lehigh. There remained for a few years a nominal Department of Military Art and Tactics, but in fact military training at Pennsylvania slept for another half-century.

It is of greater interest to note the large number of graduates and former students of the University who entered one branch or another of the military service. Shortly after the war a mural tablet was erected in College Chapel which many alumni will remember with its Greek inscription of the couplet from Simonides commemorating the Greeks who died at Thermopylæ: "O stranger go tell the Lacedemonians that here we fell in obedience to their laws," with the names of nineteen men, "Sons of the University who died to uphold the laws of their country in the war of the Great Rebellion." Some years later the industry of an alumnus was able to find the names and particulars of the military service during the Civil War of 431 men who had been connected with the College. Of these 399 were in the service of the United States, 32 of the Confederacy. The statistics of medical men are less complete, but they add up, so far as they have been compiled, to 448 in the National, 98 in the Confederate service. The number was doubtless far greater than these incomplete statistics indicate. The greater proportion of medical men in the Southern service is the natural result of the practice of Southerners coming to Philadelphia for their medical training.

Of those who served, many were prominent. The most conspicuous and the most popular was undoubtedly George B. McClellan. He spent only two years at the University, 1842-44, leaving at the end of his sophomore year to enter West Point; but his family was from Philadelphia and the widespread sympathy with his great work of gradual military preparation, a policy which he was not allowed to complete, along with his interesting personality, has kept the remembrance of him green at his early College. Major General Parke, who like McClellan transferred at the end of his sophomore year to West Point, so long commander of an important corps of the Army of the Potomac, Brigadier General Morton, killed before Petersburg,

General Samuel W. Crawford, of the class of '46, who served from Sumter to Petersburg, Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs '35, who equipped and supplied all the armies of the North, fifteen brigadier generals and scores of colonels and lower officers, besides the Surgeon General of the United States Army, two fleet surgeons and some eight hundred surgeons of various ranks, were University men, as was Lieutenant General John Clifford Pembroke '34, who commanded the Confederate forces at Vicksburg, and more than one of the officers who, in the rough reversals of war, invaded the state in which they had studied and won their degrees. Whether University men were as prominent in the War of the Rebellion as the College men had been in the Revolution may be doubted; the stage was larger, those who crowded upon it were more numerous, and distinction was with more difficulty obtained, but there is reason to believe that in both cases men connected with the University played a larger part in proportion to their numbers than those connected with any other American college. It came closer home to them.¹

THE LOSS OF THE FEDERAL GRANT

The last year of the Civil War saw a great disappointment for the University. Like other institutions it has frequently seen apparently well-founded hopes fade away like the mist. But this was a loss that in the light of subsequent events was probably the greatest the University has ever suffered in the financial and even in the educational field. The great resources and popular prestige that have been the lot of State College, the favorite subject, as it has now long been, of state support in the field of higher education, might, it seemed at one time, have been combined with the antiquity, the scholarship, and the reputation of the professional schools that would have been the contribution of the University if the two should have been united in the formative period of the State College. Such an institution might in 1864 have justified the old ideal of the men of 1791,

¹ See "Reminiscences of Men in the Civil War" and statistics in the *Alumni Register*, May 1915 and June 1917.

"the foundation of one great seminary worthy of the capital of the Commonwealth . . . calculated to diffuse the rays of knowledge through the western world."

This opportunity was offered by the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862. In this act the Federal government made a munificent land grant to the states for the purposes of education. Pennsylvania's share amounted to 780,000 acres of public land, or its money value. The gift was accepted by act of the state Legislature in April 1863. The only condition attached by the Federal government was that in one or more colleges or universities in each state instruction should be given both in general cultural subjects and agriculture and the mechanic arts, "for the promotion of the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes." Military tactics should also be taught, a natural requirement in war time.

The University saw its opportunity to increase its funds and broaden its services, and in February 1864 appointed a committee to apply for this grant or a part of it, to be used for the purposes described in the act. At the same time, in order to meet all its requirements, the Trustees expanded the name and functions of the existing if nearly dormant Department of Mines, Arts and Manufactures, renaming it the "College of Agriculture, Mines, Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts." They added to its existing faculty a Professor of Agricultural Chemistry and Scientific Agriculture, an Instructor in Practical Agriculture, a Professor of Military Tactics, and a Professor of Botany. It was also resolved to purchase a tract of fifty acres of land near the city on which to experiment and to give instruction in practical agriculture. The Federal law allowed ten per cent of the appropriation to be applied to the purchase of land but none for buildings; these the University conceived it already possessed.

A committee drew up a dignified if somewhat specious appeal to the Legislature which was printed and widely circulated, pointing out that the University already possessed the necessary equipment, that it had always been interested in useful arts and had within the last decade added to the Classical Department, Medical and Law schools, a School of Engineering and the Practical Arts, which had been active till disorganized by the Civil

War. In 1862 they had established a Department of Military Art and Tactics, according to the state law of 1861, and this had now been made a part of their regular curriculum. In addition voluntary courses were given in French, Italian, and German, and in drawing and sketching from nature. Philadelphia was adjacent to eleven counties which possessed more than half the population of the state and every variety of soil and industrial enterprise. The petitioners drew an attractive picture of students who would at the same time be mechanics or farmers, and after two or three hours of daily recitation and study in the classroom, return to the workshop, factory, mine, or furnace at which they were employed, where they would not only receive wages but be able to compare theory with practice.

With such advantages and so ready an inclination to carry out the requirements of the Federal law the University seemed to have overwhelming claims to all or a large part of the grant. Their appeal to the Legislature for the passage of an act turning the funds over to them was presented in both houses March 6, 1864. It was referred to the respective committees on education where apparently it lay indefinitely, for there were other claimants. Ten years before, in 1854, the State Agricultural Association had secured from the Legislature a charter for a "Farmers School." By 1862, the date of the Federal grant, this institution had been organized under Trustees and Faculty, had received extensive grants from the state government, purchased ground in Centre County, had opened its doors to students, and in 1862 had its name changed to the "Agricultural College of Pennsylvania." From 1862 to 1864 its doors were closed because of the enlistment of its whole student body in the Pennsylvania Volunteers, but in 1864 it signalized its reopening by applying for the Federal land grant. There were still other applicants. Next year March 8, 1865, in the State Senate, "Mr. Connell read . . . and presented to the chair a bill entitled 'an Act to appropriate part of the land scrip given to the State by the Act of Congress of July 2, 1862, to the University of Pennsylvania.'" But again this got no further than a reference to the committee on education. The University had already given up hope, for in December 1864 the Trustees had taken action to dispose of the land they

had bought in anticipation of an agricultural department, the produce of its sale to be added to general endowment. There was much delay, but finally in February 1867, the Federal endowment was turned over to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania. If a later Provost, well-beloved of the Legislature, had been in charge of the matter, the result might possibly have been different, as would in that case have been the whole later history of the University. Meanwhile the ambitious program of industrial education to which the University had committed itself remained to be worked out without either Federal or state aid.

Chapter 7

THE MOVE TO WEST PHILADELPHIA

THE OLD AND THE NEW

THE renaissance of the University, the first stirrings of which were discernible long before the middle of the century, and which became a vigorous movement after the Civil War, was a gradual development; but if a definite date for the beginning of a larger life for the University must be chosen, none probably is more defensible than the entrance into office in 1868 of Charles J. Stillé, the tenth Provost, followed closely, in 1870, by the migration of the University to its third home, in West Philadelphia. Dr. Stillé was the first Provost, barring the short and obscure incumbency of John McDowell, who was not a clergyman. He was a member of an old and well-to-do Philadelphia family, going back, as his name indicates, to the oldest racial stock, at least of those of European origin, in this region, the Swedes. He had been a student in the Academy, but had gone to Yale for his college course and was graduated there in 1839. He studied law with J. R. Ingersoll, was admitted to the bar, traveled in Europe, carried on private business in Philadelphia, wrote influential pamphlets in support of the Northern government during the Civil War, and achieved recognition as an executive by his administration of the Sanitary Fair. He was appointed Professor of Belles Lettres and English Literature as successor to Professor Coppée in 1866, and was elected Provost on the resignation of Dr. Goodwin in 1868. His somewhat stormy career as Provost will be summed up later. It was in his provostship, during the sixties and seventies and early eighties, that the University passed from its local and little-known status to a recog-

nized position among the greater educational institutions of the country.

It may be proper to observe, as this narrative follows the history of the University out from the narrower waters of its early existence upon the broad sea of its later career, that no man who graduated from it at any period is justified in a disparagement of his academic inheritance. Those who taught him were real scholars. Even a hostile critic, who in the middle of the century complains with some exaggeration of "the absence of any pride in the institution or any interest shown by the public" and points to the fact that only one donation—of \$5,000—had been made to it in the preceding eighty years, while other colleges had received numerous liberal gifts and bequests, as an obvious indication of lack of public confidence, at the same time describes the professors as "competent men and some of them excellent teachers." Graduates of the College Department were well educated as college education went in their time. Nor need any alumnus deplore the associations of his student days. Small as the group was at that time, and limited as were the opportunities for social intercourse compared with the community life of those who lived at college, there were quite enough classmates to provide congenial spirits for a variety of tastes and dispositions. The students, moreover, were for the most part drawn from families of intellectual interests and often of social position, and, as has been before remarked, many of them rose to eminence in later life.

Then why this note of depreciation so often to be found in contemporary criticism of the College, internal and external? Why was it so often and so fairly described in the first half of the century as "a small and local institution"? And how shall the sympathetic historian write of it?

Notwithstanding its long history, the thread of intellectual excellence that ran unbroken through that history, its freedom from religious restrictions and the eminence of its administrators, neither its actual condition, its recent progress, or its reputation could be considered satisfactory.

The title "university" is neither here nor there. In the American sense of "a college of liberal arts to which one or more

professional schools are adjoined," the term had been justly applied to Pennsylvania ever since it had first been claimed by Provost Smith and Dr. Morgan in 1771, subsequent to the introduction of the medical courses in 1765, and even more properly since it had been so denominated officially in the law of 1779; but this did not, unfortunately, make it great any more than it did those other American universities whose best men questioned their own use of the term. Since the raising of the college course in 1824 to four years, and the establishment of an age limit for entrance in 1826, the course of studies at Pennsylvania was not appreciably different from that of the New England and other large colleges and universities. Its teaching of the classics, of mathematics, of moral and intellectual philosophy and even of literature and history was, in the first half of the century, as advanced and as thorough as that of any other American college or university of the time. Nor were the numbers of its students and Faculty insignificant. Small as were, in comparison with modern times, the hundred or so students who were usually in attendance as undergraduates in the College, and the twenty or thirty who received their A.B. degrees each year, when reinforced by the medical and law students they made a body of some six hundred, differently distributed, it is true, but approximately as large as the student bodies of other universities. There has been in all periods at Pennsylvania too much of a tendency to identify the University with the College, and so to credit it with too small a student body.

It was neither numbers nor studies that kept Pennsylvania, before the close of the Civil War, from ranking in public estimation as equal with the most advanced colleges or universities of the time. The cause was rather a certain rigidity, a devotion to old established practice, a complacency of Trustees and Faculty in the routine that had long been followed, a lack of imagination and of boldness of conception and action that had made it indifferent to new proposals and alien to the community that surrounded it. This had held the University back. It had seemed unaware of and uninterested in the possibilities of the world around it. Dr. Horace Howard Furness, trained in the study of the most discerning of all critics of human nature, some time

later described the University as "sedate, conservative, respectable, quiescent in the belief that the methods of education which were wholesome for the fathers must be wholesome and all-sufficient for the sons and grandsons."

An enthusiastic professor on taking up, in 1866, his duties at the University, suggested to the Provost of the time that a certain change might secure for the University a wider influence in the community. The Provost replied that there were only about one hundred young men in Philadelphia who wanted a college education, that this number was not likely to increase very much even with an increase in population, and that any modification of the present system to meet the demands of public opinion was unlikely to be agreed to by the University authorities. They were doing their work well, and if this was not appreciated in Philadelphia there was nothing to be done about it. "Sad and discouraged," as he tells us, the questioner put the same suggestion before one of the older professors, who informed him that no enlargement of the present plan of education to make it more attractive to young men could possibly be attained. His advice was the same as that of the Provost, to attend to his teaching and let other things alone. Such an attitude was bound to keep the University "small and local," however thorough the drill imposed upon its students.

Although the Medical School, which largely governed itself independently of the Trustees, was less rigid, the majority of its Faculty were, in the middle of the century, opposed to the progressive ideas concerning medical education that were already, in the sixties, being urged by a group of younger men inside and outside that school.

Much of this was now to be changed. The period from 1868 to 1880 saw the move to a new and more spacious location, the establishment of new departments, a marked increase in the number of students and Faculty, and new cultural and physical interests. It saw the collection of considerable sums for the extension and support of the University; above all this period saw the emergence from its own midst of new projects, and a more ready responsiveness to those suggested from without. Bridges were built which led later to a vastly wider area of interest. At

the same time, externally, the University was emerging from its relative obscurity and developing new and original activities that gave it consideration in the larger university world and in the surrounding community.

THE THIRD HOME

By 1870 the University was ready again to leave the shell that had begun to constrict it. Its location on Ninth Street had, by the middle of the century, become much as that on Fourth Street had been at its beginning. The College and Medical buildings, notwithstanding their quiet dignity, were antiquated and inadequate. The region in which they lay had become disreputable and was still deteriorating. Some hundreds of college and medical students crowding boarding houses and finding their amusements in the very center of a large city were not conducive to the respectability of the locality. Provost Stillé noted that it was "a vile neighborhood, growing viler every day." He pleaded also for the vivifying influence that would come from new and more appropriate physical surroundings. Above all the tract of land now at the University's disposal was too small, and could not well be increased in that congested neighborhood. Increasing numbers, new departments, additional subjects of teaching, all of which were either existent or anticipated, required more elbow room. The endowed School of Agriculture and Industrial Arts, if it had eluded the grasp of the Trustees, had stretched their imaginations. The University was already straining at its physical bounds. There must be space for an expanding future.

Just west of the Schuylkill, in Blockley Township, lying between the high land on which ran the road to Darby (now Woodland Avenue) and the strip of swampy land along the river, was a tract of some two hundred acres, known as "Blockley Farm" or the "Almshouse Farm." It had been purchased by the city from the Hamiltons, the proprietors of "Woodlands," in 1830, at \$275 per acre, as a site for the city almshouse, which had to be moved from its downtown location. The almshouse buildings were erected there between 1830 and 1834, but, although well designed and finely located on the highest ground,

they occupied only a small part of the tract. In the growing recognition of the limitations and requirements of the University for more land, an interested alumnus, Nathaniel B. Browne of the class of 1838, a lawyer active in political and financial affairs, later a Trustee, living in West Philadelphia, called the attention of the Trustees to this vacant land and expressed the belief that the city would sell a sufficient amount for the University's needs at a favorable price. Indeed his idea was that the University should buy much more than it needed, selling off some for endowment purposes, while enhancing the value to the city of what it retained.

This proposal brought up the old question recurrent since the first meeting of the Trustees, in November 1749: should the University remain a city college, with the advantages and disadvantages of such a position, or should it establish itself in some rural locality or small town such as Princeton, Harvard, and Yale had adjusted themselves to and to which in turn they had given distinction? This course was the proposal of one of the most vigorous of the Trustees, Mr. McCall, who urged a complete change of location, even if it involved some other changes of plan. The West Philadelphia location seemed to offer a compromise, and after much discussion steps were taken for the purchase from the city of a large part of the West Philadelphia property. The city government was less generous than it had been when its annual grant to the College had been so helpful to it in its infant days, and indeed less liberal than it has frequently shown itself since, when it has at last become proud of the University. After prolonged negotiation ten acres were purchased in 1870 at \$8,000 per acre. This began the process by which the University has added "house to house and field to field," nibbling at the old almshouse tract and adjoining property, obtaining possession of it on every variety of consideration, till it has now more than a hundred acres, for the most part covered with buildings for purposes not conceived of in 1870. But for a time the four buildings erected in the four immediately following years gave adequate space for the academic needs of the University and for the hospital which completed the equipment of the Medical Department.

Of these four greenstone structures, so distinct from later buildings, which formed the nucleus of the University's third home, T. W. Richards, Instructor in Drawing in the old building and soon to be made Professor of Architecture in the new, was chosen as architect on September 20, 1870. His designs were severely restricted by the requirements of economy, but with the constant watchful interest of Provost Stillé and of William Sellers, chairman of the building committee of the Board of Trustees, one after another the buildings were brought to completion. The corner stone at the northeast corner of the first and main building, College Hall, was laid with the usual picturesque ceremonial, January 15, 1871. The silver trowel, used to spread the mortar, the property of Mr. Struthers, the builder, had already done service in laying the corner stone of the old Ninth Street buildings, the United States Bank, the Mint, the Merchants' Exchange, and other public buildings. Mr. John C. Cresson of the Board of Trustees deposited the leaden box, containing a curious collection of academic, public, and personal memorials, in the hollow of the stone, where presumably they still lie, drew over it a marble slab and pronounced it "true, square and level." The building was completed and inaugurated with much public ceremony, October 11, 1872. The students had already deserted the Ninth Street building and had gathered in this the previous month for the opening of the College term.

Tragedy stepped in for a moment when in the midst of the celebration of the opening Professor Frazer, for almost thirty years the most active professor in the field of science and now showing his friends around the new rooms, suddenly staggered, sat down, and passed away in a heart attack, a precursor of a disproportionate number of college professors who have died with similar suddenness from the same cause.

THE TOWNE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL

In the general discussions in 1867 and 1868 that led to the adoption of changes in the Department of Arts and to the plan of removal to West Philadelphia a strong belief was expressed in the desirability of reorganizing the dormant Faculty of Sci-

ence. From this proposal emerged in 1869 an altogether new scientific department. The cumbrous old name, School of Agriculture, Mines, Manufactures, and the Mechanic Arts, which endeavored to describe all its objects, like an old-fashioned title page, was abandoned, and it was described simply as the Department of Science; later, on the announcement that it was to receive the residuary estate of John Henry Towne, one of the Trustees, this was changed to Towne Scientific School, the name it still retains. In the new building and as to much of its curriculum it was arranged to be parallel to the Department of Arts. One end of the College building was appropriated to each of the two departments, with common rooms—library, chapel, assembly room, and gymnasium—in the center. The Faculty of Science, like the Medical School and the Law School, had a Dean, leaving the Arts Department under the direct supervision of the Provost. So with its Faculty consisting of eight professors and instructors in scientific subjects, and six common to both Faculties, teaching subjects of general culture taken by Arts and Science students alike, the third Department of Science started on its career. It was the fourth University school to be founded, in succession to Arts, Medicine, and Law.

The Faculty included as its Dean J. Peter Lesley, Professor of Natural Philosophy; as professors of Chemistry and Mathematics Professors Frazer and Kendall, of Architecture Professor Richards, all of whom were from the old school; and, as new appointees, Genth, a noted German chemist, and Professor Franck, a civil engineer. Professor Robert Ellis Thompson and Professor McElroy were already in the Arts Faculty. Seidensticker and Brégy gave the German and French courses, and Samuel Cleveland became Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. Provost Stillé taught history and English literature. By September 1872 the new school was ready to issue an announcement of its organization and to receive students in its rooms in College Hall. The plan, much better worked out than in either of the two earlier attempts to construct a scientific course, contemplated devotion of the first two years to general culture subjects scarcely different from the Arts course except that they required modern instead of ancient languages and gave some preparatory

scientific work. The third and fourth years were given strictly to practical scientific preparation for later professional life respectively in chemistry, mining, civil and mechanical engineering. Architecture was soon added to the other four professional objectives.

Their rooms in College Hall—the basement and all three stories of the eastern half of the building—for some years gave these courses the requisite facilities, though as the school grew, one branch of its work after another was destined to move to more spacious quarters. At the same time the western end was not only the home of the Department of Arts but provided rooms for the scientific subjects of a more cultural nature, such as lecture courses on chemistry, physics, and mathematics. After 1874 most of the third floor was the lecture hall of the Law School. All these subjects have for the most part emigrated to more specialized homes. The intellectual foundations, so to speak, of a large proportion of the buildings now on the campus were laid in College Hall.

Few academic buildings have seen more varied use. The basement, which was the scene of "corner fights" and other relaxations of young barbarians at play; the chapel, which was only too often the scene of forced attendance at services worthy a better acceptance, and of petty disorder, was also the stage for the picturesque prayers of Professor Thompson, the haunting echoes of Professor Clarke's voluntaries, of Dr. Furness' inimitable readings from Shakespeare, and of scores of lectures and talks by famous men from abroad; the rooms of "Philo" and "Zelo," just under the roof, where regular meetings of the societies and occasional interminable talks with congenial spirits suggest a leisure that seems to have disappeared from the world —these in the backward look compare not unfavorably in value with the classrooms in which the students were, or were supposed to be, getting their college education.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COURSE IN MUSIC

The same impetus that had led to the decision to move to West Philadelphia and to the erection of the new group of buildings

there made the Board of Trustees responsive to the suggestion of introducing new subjects and indeed to the establishment of what soon became new departments. In 1875 appeared one of the earliest of these new departments in the form of a Professorship of the Science of Music.

There had always been an appreciative attitude toward music at the University. Payment for music at the colonial College Commencements was one of the most constant items in the treasury accounts. Formal musical affairs were not infrequent. Among the varied requests for the use of the old Hall, after the move to Ninth Street, those for musical purposes were never refused. Rather suddenly, however, in 1875, the science of music came on the stage at the University through a letter to the Provost in 1874 from Rev. C. D. Hartranft, a graduate of the class of 1861. He was a clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N.J., where he had been given by Rutgers the degree of Doctor of Music in 1871, as a recognition of his introduction of music of a high grade in his church and in that city. He now proposed the creation of a Faculty of Music at Pennsylvania, possibly with the expectation of himself filling a position in it, for he was a candidate for election the next year.

The Provost and Trustees were sympathetic with the proposal, and a modest professorship was established in the year 1875. It was to be experimental, for the term of three years. Compensation was to be only what the professor obtained from the sale of tickets for his course, and if it proved that the room in the new College building set apart for his use had to be altered, the alterations were to be made at his expense. He was allowed at first to set his own price for his teaching, but later it was established at \$30 for each course. In addition to Professor Hartranft, J. Kendrick Payne, Michael Cross, who later became the first leader of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and Hugh A. Clarke were candidates. Professor Clarke was elected, and long remained the whole faculty. He came of a musical family. His grandfather was an English composer; his father held a degree in music from Oxford, emigrated to Canada, and was long Professor of Music in the University of Toronto.

Although Professor Clarke's appointment was for only three

years, successive reappointments made it in effect permanent, and he continued to hold the position for more than fifty years. In the beginning control was kept over his work by requiring that a syllabus of each course he proposed to give must be first submitted for approval to the Executive Committee of the Department of Arts, to which the new professorship was administratively attached, although its holder was not a member of the Faculty. The plan grew; the next year, 1876, the Trustees resolved to grant the degree of Bachelor of Music, requiring for it a thorough study of harmony and counterpoint, history and analysis of classical compositions, and the production of a musical composition that should meet all standards of criticism. The science of music remained for many years one of those subjects on the fringe of college training, taken seriously by a handful of students under the supervision of one teacher, to become, much later, part of a strong department and itself to be broadened and strengthened to its present distinguished position. Professor Clarke was the mentor of the University in all matters musical. He played the organ regularly in chapel during the days of compulsory attendance and on all special occasions. He composed the music for the Greek play, *The Acharnians*, given by the students in 1886, and the next year was given the degree of Doctor of Music in recognition of that difficult and distinguished service. Ten years later he composed the music for the second Greek play, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. He was a cultured man; he put pressure on his students to take courses in English literature, and himself wrote many books about music. The later development of the extensive and popular Department of Music at the University owes much to the long and dignified career of its founder.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DENTISTRY

The fifth major department of the University to be founded, the School of Dentistry, was a child of the Medical School. At a meeting of the Medical Faculty December 1, 1874, "the propriety of associating certain Dental branches with the instruction of the School" was considered, and two distinguished names, those

of Dr. Agnew and Dr. Leidy, appear as a committee to confer on the subject with some of the prominent dentists of the city. Dentistry was already taught in professional schools and had been since their inauguration in Baltimore in 1839; there were two dental colleges in Philadelphia; so presumably it was rather with the idea of extending the functions of the Medical School than a sense of need for such action on their part that interested the Medical Faculty in the matter. Their committee reported in February 1875, and a recommendation on the subject was pressed upon the Board of Trustees, but at that time unsuccessfully. Dr. Wood, chairman of the Trustees' committee on the Medical School, did not think well of the proposition, and after some further consultation it was dropped.

Two years later, December 1877, the Medical Faculty took the matter up in a different form. They made overtures to the Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery, which had been in existence since 1856, with a view to the union of the two institutions—or rather, as it was bound to prove, the absorption of the Dental College into the University. This probable absorption was resented by some members of its Faculty, but two, Dr. Darby and Dr. Essig, favored the plan, and in later conferences intimated that they would willingly resign from the old school and accept positions in the University. The Trustees of the University now favored the plan, and in March 1878 resolved to establish a Dental Department with a Faculty of eight, six to be present members of the Medical Faculty, two to be the members of the Dental College already named. They were thereupon elected March 12, 1878, resigned their old positions and became the nucleus of the new Dental Department of the University. A third, Dr. Truman, was soon afterward secured, and became, at first, Secretary, then Dean of the school and so remained for many years. In November 1878 it was resolved that graduates of the Dental School should receive the degree D.D.S., the sixth regular degree in course provided for in the University statutes. The professors were promised lecture and operating rooms in the Medical Building. It is indicative of the lack of administrative coördination at that time that neither the janitor of the building

nor even the Provost, Dr. Stillé, knew anything of these arrangements.

However, the pioneers of the new department were given some dark rooms in the basement and gathered around them a little group of thirty students, mostly men who had followed them from their old school. A supply of patients for their clinics, the principal need in dental instruction, was obtained from the adjacent University Hospital, "patients who were," according to the records, "sick men who smelled of iodoform"; others from the almshouse, "paupers who were dirty and ragged," and still others from the growing population of West Philadelphia, whose maids were induced to come by announcement cards distributed from door to door. Classes were begun in the unfavorable surroundings described above, but they were successful from the beginning.

Two needs called for the erection of a new building: first a change in the method of medical instruction, second the demand for more accommodations for the rising Dental School. Medical instruction had formerly consisted merely of the delivery of lectures, illumined in a few cases by showing of plaster casts and illustrations by the lecturer and to some extent improved by clinical observation when there was opportunity. This instruction was supplemented by work under privately paid quiz-masters, recognized by the Faculty. Now changes had been introduced into the curriculum, as will be later explained, that required laboratory instruction. For this there were no facilities in the new medical building which had been put up in West Philadelphia. The course was also in 1876 lengthened to three years. The Medical Faculty, in a communication to the Trustees dated March 1878, described their difficulties. "The present Medical Hall [now Logan Hall] is well adapted to the old plan of teaching, which required no laboratory instruction, but it is totally inadequate for the new plan of teaching which calls for elaborate personal instruction of each student." The medical professors could not carry out the new curriculum "without a separate building specially constructed for laboratory purposes." With the growing dental courses demanding better facilities and

the Medical Faculty requiring additional space, the Trustees determined to erect a new building in conjunction with the Medical Building, the fourth building of the original West Philadelphia group, to be used jointly for the Dental School, the chemical and other laboratories, for the Medical School, and later for its dissecting rooms and storage rooms for cadavers. Fortunately there was available a sum of \$50,000 which had been collected as a guarantee fund for professors' salaries, in case the extension of the course from two to three years and the alteration by which medical professors were to receive salaries instead of enjoying the fees of their students, should leave the old Faculty in a worse position. There was, however, no appreciable diminution of numbers of students, so the guarantee fund was not needed and could be used for building purposes. The Medical Faculty also subscribed.

To the Dental School, thus provided, for the time at least, with rooms and equipment, students came from other states and foreign countries in constantly increasing numbers, so that the Faculty of the school were in a position to increase their requirements from students on the one hand and to ask better facilities from the Trustees on the other. American dental schools were in a particularly favorable position so far as applicants from abroad were concerned. The reputation of American dentists was high in Europe, South America, and the Orient, and students naturally came from those regions to obtain their training in this country. The University dental courses have shared more than proportionately in this popularity from the time of their foundation. It may be questioned whether the graduates of any other department are so widely distributed over the world. The "American Dentist" so frequently announced on doorplates in foreign countries is more than likely to be a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania.¹

The fortunes of the school cannot, unfortunately, be traced down through the later periods, in which it came to occupy more and more imposing quarters and to rise to higher and higher

¹ Some facts concerning the earliest days of the Dental School are to be found in *The Dental Alumni Annual*, Vol. 16; and in R. E. Koch, *History of Dental Surgery*, Chicago, 1909.

requirements for entrance and for graduation. It was fully abreast of the Medical School, from which it was, as has been said, an offshoot, and in some respects it led it.

THE MEDICAL SCHOOL AND THE HOSPITAL

Again the Medical School and the College failed to keep step, for during the middle years of the century when the College was showing signs of advance and struggling into greater activity and a wider recognition, the Medical School was losing its position of preëminence and for a while decreasing in numbers and possibly in excellence of teaching. This was not through lack of interest on the part of the Trustees, for in the spring of 1836 three members of the Board resigned in protest against what one of them described as devoting the resources of the institution to the building up of the Medical School at the expense of the College proper. A weak College and strong Medical School seemed to him an inverted pyramid, but he found the influence of the Medical Faculty too strong to permit the changes in the institution he thought desirable.¹

The old medical course occupied only four months of the year, from early in November to the first of March. In 1844 an attempt was made to lengthen the term on the ground that attendance upon so many lectures a day put too much strain on the students; to this, objection was made that remaining in the city for a longer term would put them to greater expense. Therefore at that time only two weeks were added to the medical course.

In 1859 things were going badly. Rival medical institutions were growing and drawing students away from the University. Jefferson greatly outnumbered Pennsylvania and was sending out more graduates yearly. An upstart southern institution, Nashville, had for the current year 442 students while the University had only 409. Students no longer "crowd the benches of our school," as the Medical Faculty explained in a memorial to the Board of Trustees. They described the gloomy condition and prospects of the school, the diminution of the income from their professorships and their apprehension of further "retro-

¹ C. C. Binney, *Life of Horace Binney*, Philadelphia, 1903, p. 134.

gradation." In the attempt to resist this decay the price of "tickets" for the courses had been reduced from \$20 to \$15 and the graduation fee from \$40 to \$30. Nevertheless the profits of a chair in the Medical Department had been reduced by half, not now reaching on the average more than \$2,500 annually, as compared with the \$5,000 or \$6,000 of earlier times. There was fear that as vacancies arose the University would not be able to secure the most valuable type of physicians to fill them. One critic speaks of the occasional attempts at reform as "the bright bubbles that burst upon the stagnant waters of medical education."

The Civil War was a serious crisis for the Medical School, with its preponderance of southern students already referred to, and for a few years it was almost broken up. On the other hand the year 1865 saw a great addition to its equipment in the foundation of the Auxiliary School of Medicine. This was supported and eventually endowed by Dr. George B. Wood, long a professor in the Medical School but now a Trustee. It was intended to supplement the short term of the regular medical courses, which were still only four and a half months long, by a series of allied courses given in the spring. Its Faculty consisted of professors of zoölogy and comparative anatomy, botany, mineralogy and geology, hygiene and medical jurisprudence and toxicology. All students and graduates of the Medical School could take these courses free, others paid \$10 per ticket for each course, or \$35 for all five courses. Many of the best students took these courses immediately after the regular course was over. In 1877 there were 436 matriculates, and eleven received degrees in June of that year.

It impresses a modern reader as anomalous that to graduates of the Auxiliary School of Medicine the degree of Doctor of Philosophy should be given. About a hundred men hold or have held this degree from this school, in addition to their medical degree. It was conferred between 1876 and 1881. At first those who took the courses auxiliary to medicine received no degree, but in 1870 the Faculty petitioned the Trustees that one should be granted after the medical degree had been obtained, two full courses pursued, and proper examinations passed. They sug-

gested the Doctor of Philosophy. This was a German degree, practically unknown in America or in England, and there seemed no impropriety in adopting it and adapting it to American uses, especially as this school involved some general culture besides the technical medical courses. "Philosophy" had stood as much for natural science in University history as for more abstract studies.

In 1876, however, the use of Ph.D. for advanced work by Johns Hopkins University, in imitation of the German degree, called attention to the anomaly, and in November 1879 its use was ordered to be suspended. Dr. George B. Wood, the founder of the school, to whom this suspension would probably have been unwelcome, had died in the summer of 1879. Those already entered received the old degree. Subsequently the degree of Bachelor of Sciences Auxiliary to Medicine was given. In 1898, when the regular term of the Medical School had been lengthened and advanced work provided for in other ways, the courses auxiliary to medicine were suspended and the income of the endowment, some \$44,000, diverted to various purposes analogous to its original use.

The ten years from 1870 to 1880, the last ten years of Dr. Stillé's administration, the first ten years of the University's life in West Philadelphia, formed a period of striking progress in the history of the medical interests of the University. This progress was much encouraged, in some cases it was initiated, by the Medical Alumni Society formed in 1870. It was from this body that the plan of the University Hospital and of the Dental School emanated. Year after year the excellent addresses before the society, given by the most progressive and thoughtful of the professors, or graduates who had obtained distinction, called attention to the needs of American medical scholarship and, with almost utopian hopefulness, to the possibilities of Pennsylvania fulfilling those needs. The addresses of Dr. Alfred Stillé in 1873 and of Dr. Norcom of South Carolina in 1878 were especially notable.¹ During 1873 and 1874 the new Medical Hall in West Philadelphia, the building now known as Logan

¹ See the collection of these addresses and proceedings of the Medical Alumni Society in the University Library. 378.748.PZMT.3

Hall, and the University Hospital on its five-acre lot between Spruce and Pine and Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets were going up on plans carefully worked out and conforming in design to College Hall. Since the old buildings in Ninth Street had been sold to the United States government in 1873, the Medical School bade fair to be homeless for the winter of 1873-74. After fruitless attempts to secure permission from the government for one more year's use of the old building, quarters at Ninth and Locust streets were rented and there the medical lectures and as much as possible of the other work of the school was carried on during that year. The Hospital was dedicated June 4, 1874, and the new Medical Hall was occupied for the first time at the opening of the succeeding term, October 12, 1874.

In July 1875 the Medical Faculty, freed from the inhibition of want of space by the conveniences of the West Philadelphia buildings, submitted to the Board of Trustees a memorial indicating their desire that extensive changes should be introduced into the school, and asked for the appointment of a conference committee. As a result a special committee under the interested chairmanship of Fairman Rogers, already mentioned in connection with the Scientific School, was appointed with the duty of working out along with the Faculty a new curriculum and organization of the Medical School. This joint committee, after a number of weekly meetings and correspondence with the Faculty through the winter of 1875 and 1876, proposed that the teaching year should be prolonged to five months, the course be extended to three years, studies arranged in a graded course, with entrance examinations, yearly examinations, and a final examination for the degree at the close, and that the fees of students "should be paid to the Treasurer of the University, the expenses of the school [estimated that year at \$11,000] should be borne by the Board of Trustees, and the professors should be paid fixed salaries."¹

It was anticipated that the lengthened course would reduce the number of students, and it was therefore agreed that both for the sake of the professors and the Trustees the changes should

¹ See the Report of Special Committee of Medical Department in the University Library. 378.748.PZMB.2.

be postponed till a guarantee fund to cover the professors' salaries up to \$3,000 each should be collected. This was achieved within the next year to an amount approximating \$50,000. In 1877, therefore, for the first time since the foundation of the school in 1765, medical professors received their salaries from the University, instead of from their students. At the same time it was announced in the catalogue of 1877-78 that the medical course would in the future be of three years. The fee was established at \$140 for each of the first two years, \$100 for the third year. But strangely enough the number of entering students under these conditions was greater than before. The guarantee fund, therefore, with the consent of the subscribers, lay in the hands of the Trustees available for other purposes. About the same time Mrs. John Rhea Barton left a bequest of \$50,000 to endow a chair of surgery.

The circumstances under which these funds were drawn upon to erect the fourth building of the original group, at Thirty-sixth and Spruce streets, to meet the crying demands for laboratories and operating rooms for the new Dental Department have already been referred to in the description of the foundation of that school. For a long time there had been a growing interest in laboratory teaching, a desire to bring the students into more direct contact with the objects of their study. Even before 1870 we hear of work, not only in the laboratory of chemistry, which had been especially equipped in the earlier medical buildings, but in laboratories of anatomy, physiology, pharmacy, pathology, general histology, and even in manipulation of the microscope, though where these laboratories were tucked away remains a mystery. The University Hospital doubtless provided some room and the new medical building offered more. But still there was demand for more space until the dentistry laboratory building of 1878 offered two whole floors for chemistry and pharmacy, and the third for a physiological and histological laboratory. Somewhat later the upper floor became the general dissecting room of the department and the basement the storage room for cadavers.

The culmination of this ten years of progress was in the establishment in 1878 tentatively, and in 1879 definitely, of post-

graduate medical teaching. In the first of those years several of the laboratories and certain clinics were opened to advanced students and graduates, offering postgraduate instruction at a general matriculation fee of five dollars. In 1878-79 a regular postgraduate course for bedside and dispensary instruction was organized consisting of two terms, each of three months, one beginning in November, the second in April, two lectures weekly in six branches, the fee for the whole course being \$100, or \$24 for each branch elected separately. Much had now been accomplished, and in 1879 an alumnus could refer to the University Medical School as "our rejuvenated *Alma Mater*." Of what has been accomplished in the half-century and more that has passed since, no continuous narrative, unfortunately, can be given in this book. Only where it is momentarily a part of the general stream of University history will it emerge again.

THE CLOSE OF DR. STILLÉ'S ADMINISTRATION

With all these events Dr. Stillé was closely concerned. He had an active administration of twelve years; few men have been more devoted to their task. He was anxious to put the University in the position he thought it should hold in the local community and in the nation, and had certain specific reforms he wanted to introduce. His attitude was quite similar to that of Dr. De-Lancey forty years earlier, though his outlook was broader and his conception of the proper functions of the University higher. Indeed, in the long list of Provosts there are few who have not begun their administration with lofty hopes and plans, none who have not labored devotedly to do their best in the office, and few, it is sad to think, who have not closed the period of their service with disappointment and sometimes under criticism. This was markedly true of Dr. Stillé, the tenth Provost.

It was he who, as a newly appointed professor, had come away, as already told, from his first interview with the former Provost "sad and discouraged" at his fatalistic attitude. On the question then at issue, before he had become Provost, his advocacy had won success. This was the proposed introduction of the elective system, a plan much discussed in colleges at the time, and recently

introduced at Harvard and elsewhere. On his initiation it was approved by the Faculty in December 1866, by the Trustees in January 1867. It is hard to realize, now that self-determination in the choice of studies has gone so far, how revolutionary this disruption of the prescribed curriculum was considered to be. College students might now, although still bound to the old curriculum for the first two years, choose for their junior and senior years between the ancient and certain modern languages, and between certain scientific studies and history and English literature, and would still obtain their A.B. degree. It was taken so seriously by the College Faculty that they issued a special printed description of the new system.

It was doubtless this activity of Dr. Stillé that suggested, as told above, his election as Provost. He was inaugurated and gave a notable address on September 30, 1868. He entered immediately upon an active program of change and development. He was heartily in favor of the move to West Philadelphia, and worked strenuously for it and for obtaining the required land from the city authorities. He was much interested in the establishment of the new scientific department; with one of the Trustees he visited Lehigh University with the idea of obtaining suggestions for this organization and persuading Dr. Wetherill, Professor of Chemistry there, to become head of the new school at Pennsylvania. It was a day of university reorganization under the initiative of individual leadership. President Eliot of Harvard, President White of Cornell, and President McCosh of Princeton all began their transforming labors at about the same time, and Dr. Stillé was ambitious to do the same at Pennsylvania.

Much of what was in progress required more funds. The elective system involved professorships of the modern languages, the new buildings in West Philadelphia had to be paid for, the reconstruction of the Scientific School involved teachers on salaries, not as before dependent on the fees of their students. In 1875 it was announced that the residuary estate of one of the Trustees, Mr. John Henry Towne would eventually come to the Scientific School, but although it induced the Trustees to give his name to the school it produced no funds for many years. All this extension meant endowment, and it was with a realiza-

tion of this that the Trustees in 1868, at the same time they decided on the move to West Philadelphia and the resuscitation of the Scientific School and other changes, appointed a committee to endeavor to raise a fund of half a million dollars, much the most ambitious effort since Dr. William Smith had been sent to England in 1756 to ask subscriptions for the colonial College. It was a difficult undertaking; the inertia of a somewhat stolid community, lack of local knowledge of and pride in the University, and many competing demands had to be met. John Welsh, a devoted Trustee and an influential citizen, was made chairman of the committee, but in the midst of his labors he was in 1870 made United States minister to Great Britain, and for a year and a half was absent from the country. The endowment fund dragged. There was also a rival fund. A vigorous group of professors in the Medical School had obtained the approval of the Board of Trustees for the collection of funds for the erection of the Hospital, and secured an appropriation from the state Legislature dependent on matching its amount or somewhat more from private sources. Their extreme and successful efforts to get private subscriptions made the endowment of the College and Scientific School no easier to secure. The erection of the new buildings had been begun with money borrowed on a mortgage on all the University's property, but the fortunate sale of the old Ninth Street property, largely through the efforts of Mr. Welsh, to the United States government as a site for their new post office, soon put money in the hands of the Trustees. This came near to paying for all new buildings, but provided no funds. For a while the University was out of debt, but the College had no endowment.

In all these proceedings Provost Stillé had been deeply involved, but he had found much to criticize in what was done and what was left undone by the Board of Trustees. He early became convinced, like some of his predecessors, that what he called "the torpor and decay which had settled down on the University" was "due to the fatal defect in its organization . . . without a recognized and efficient head." He believed that the objects and needs of the University could be more authoritatively explained and that subscriptions could be more successfully obtained if

the Provost were made really the responsible head of the University. Soon after his installation he proposed to the Trustees that this should be done by so changing the charter that the Provost should be President of the Board and head of every Faculty, just as were the Presidents of Harvard and Yale. A committee of the Board to which the proposal was referred somewhat surprisingly reported favorably in March 1871. To the adoption of the change there was one evident obstacle. The Faculty of the Medical School were as yet semi-independent, receiving the fees of their students and paying from these their own salaries and the expenses of their department. They were of course subject to the Trustees, but with the Provost they had only the most tenuous relation. The proposed change would make the Provost actual head of the medical as well as of the other Faculties, and to that extent reduce their independence. In deference to that department and, according to rumor, in fear of losing a prospective bequest from a wealthy medical member of the Board, the proposal was defeated, and the University remained as before, merely a corporation governed by a board, or, rather, as the Provost pointed out, by committees of that board.

Despite the refusal of the request for powers to introduce reforms, many excellent achievements date from Dr. Stillé's provostship: the definite establishment of the Scientific Department, the reorganization of the Department of Arts, the foundation of free public-school scholarships in return for the land given by the city to the University, and the admission of women to certain courses of lectures. But these achievements were not effected without friction. His defeat in the proposed increase of the powers of his office left him embittered, and more than ever convinced of the "fatal defect of a vicious organization in the governing body [the Trustees] that made itself felt in every department of the University." He had staunch friends on the Board, such as Mr. Welsh and Mr. Fraley, and, as he acknowledged, some valuable new men had been elected, but this did not change the system, so he made another effort to achieve leadership in 1874. This resulted only in his admission to the Board meetings to give information and to enable him to act as a medium of communication between the Trustees and the

Faculty. After this the limitation of his powers became more or less an obsession with him.

In all his actions he created more antagonism than was necessary. For all his devotion and foresight concerning the needs of the University, Dr. Stillé was contentious, tactless, and irascible. The writer of this chronicle, a freshman in Dr. Stillé's last year, can see him still, white and glowering with anger at disorder in the college chapel which, however exasperating, was hardly of sufficient importance for such a tragic display of speechless wrath.

His final conflict with the Trustees was not merely personal, but one in which he represented the Faculty. Discipline, the bane of college life in early days, was one of those subjects which lay on the border line between the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees and those of the Faculties. Its history had been inconsistent; sometimes the Trustees had asserted their superior powers, then for long periods they had, by resolution or by connivance, left such matters entirely in the hands of the Faculty. Even the latest by-law on the subject, that of 1877, providing that each Faculty should govern its own students "under the general supervision, control and order of the Board of Trustees" was ambiguous. The Provost and Faculty interpreted it as leaving questions of discipline entirely in their hands; it might well be interpreted as recognizing the right of the Trustees to consider appeal as part of their "general supervision."

In the fall of 1879 two students were expelled on the recommendation of the committee on discipline of the College Faculty. The parents of both appealed to the Board of Trustees against what they considered undue severity in the punishment. There was no question of the facts of the cases. Both were referred by the Board to a committee of their own members, much to the surprise of Dr. Stillé, who expected the Trustees to decline to intervene and to refer the petitioners back to the Faculty. The committee in the first case stated their agreement with the action of the Faculty, but referred the second back to the Faculty for a rehearing and report to the Trustees, with the intimation that the Board would then take such action as they thought best. Against this resolution of the Board Dr. Stillé protested vigor-

ously, and determined in his own mind, as he says, to resign if the determination of the Board was insisted on.¹

The case was not made any easier by the fact that the student concerned was grandson of a member of the Board.² At the meeting at which the Provost's protest was received, strong statements of the powers of the Board were made; among others, that the authority of the Board was absolute over all acts of the Faculty in matters both of instruction and discipline, and consequently that the appeal in this case was quite justifiable. At the request of the Provost, on the other hand, a committee of the College Faculty, of which the Vice-Provost was chairman, drew up and submitted to the Trustees at their meeting in January 1880 a long "Report on the Constitutional Relations of the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania to its Government and Discipline," insisting that all disciplinary powers had been delegated exclusively to the Faculty; this elicited no comment from the Board. The Provost then announced his intention to resign.

He wrote at the same time a long letter to the Board, devoted partly to a defense of his own policy, partly to recommendations for changes in the system of government of the University. He called attention to the fact that the University had now six departments, each under a different Faculty, and more than a thousand students; and that it could not be expected that Trustees giving an hour once a month, or somewhat more if they were serving on committees, should understand or appreciate the problems of so large and varied an institution. He pointed out that

¹ Is it beneath the dignity of a history of the University to print in the obscurity of a footnote the piece of doggerel which, sung in the basement of College Hall and overheard by the Provost, put Provost, College Faculty, and Trustees, by the ears and caused the expulsion of the composer? "Pomp" was the colored college messenger.

"Pomp and Stillé had a fight.
They fit all day and they fit all night,
And in the morning they were seen
A rollin' down the bowlin' green."

² The culprit, Eli K. Price Jr., who was graduated from College in 1881 and from the Law School in 1883, seems to have borne no malice, for in 1899 he was instrumental in securing from members of his family a gift of \$25,000 toward the cost of the Law School building, and in 1921 he became a Trustee.

The system which now prevails is not one that would ever have been adopted as a method of government of a University if the question of organization presented itself now for the first time. . . . Under changed conditions of the present day it has survived its period of usefulness.

He gives his ideal of an effective head.

We shall never succeed as others have done until we find a man whom we shall recognize as an organizer, a leader, whom we shall trust, because we know he has been specially trained, and that he will give all his energy and capacity to this work in which he is engaged.

He then drew up a list of six points on which he believed the charter of the University should be revised. The Faculty at the same time addressed to the Trustees a letter signed by all the professors and instructors in the departments of Arts and Science expressing the hope that Dr. Stillé might be induced to withdraw his resignation, and endorsing the proposals for the increase of the powers of the Provost that had come so near adoption in 1871. Notwithstanding this appeal and expostulations and efforts on the part of a number of the members of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Stillé did not withdraw his resignation and it was finally accepted.¹

¹ He gives an account of his administration in a privately printed pamphlet, *Reminiscences of a Provost, 1868-1880*. It is not necessary to accept all that is said in this bitter statement as fair or even as correct. Dr. Stillé was not an accurate historian in matters involving his feelings. His memoir of Dr. Smith, the first Provost, was, like the *Reminiscences*, a partisan pamphlet, written to indicate what he thought the proper position of the Provost. Inaccurate in several places and biased in its interpretation of the act of 1779, it has been the source of much misunderstanding. Dr. Stillé wrote several historical works of a less partisan character, and published some of his University lectures in an interesting volume, *Studies in Medieval History*.

Book IV

MODERN TIMES

1881-1940



Chapter 8

THE ERA OF EXPANSION

The Administration of Dr. William Pepper

1881-1894

THE NEW PROVOSTSHIP

THE University at last had a head. With the introduction of changes in the position of the Provost long overdue, and without which the nominee would not accept the office, a new era of efficiency and development was entered upon. The restricted position of the Provost, like that title itself, had been an anomaly from the beginning. Both reflected the supremacy of the group of generous contributors who had founded the institution and had become not only its Trustees but its rulers. The active personality of the first Provost, Dr. William Smith, preserved the colonial College from a conflict of jurisdictions, although at the cost of the alienation of Franklin and of its separation in spirit from the great body of the community that surrounded it. It was never, until these modern days, the civic institution Franklin planned.

The University of the State of Pennsylvania conceded to the second provost, Dr. Ewing, all the authority he cared to claim. But ever since the union of 1791, except for short periods, the Provost had been, as has been repeatedly pointed out, in no proper sense head of the institution. His position was one of distinction but not of power. His headship was quite different from that of the presidents of other American colleges and universities, and successive Provosts had looked with longing at the freedom of action and opportunity for influence of the presidents of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia, and indeed of many smaller

and younger colleges. Pennsylvania had continued to be governed in its educational as well as its material side by its Board of Trustees, except perhaps when Dr. DeLancey was Provost and for the early part of the provostship of Dr. Beasley. It would never, it is true, have been impossible for a man of sufficiently dominating personality so to transform the office as to make of it a means of imposing his ideas upon Trustees and Faculty, but everything was against such a transformation—the legal power, the traditions, the sense of duty, the very distinction of the Board of Trustees; the habitual acceptance of routine by the Faculty, the tough resistance of the local community to the provision of the sinews of war for any campaign of progress. At any rate, no such personage had until 1881 appeared on the scene.

It was largely the course of events, the slow evolution of an organization too large and too varied in its requirements to be administered by committees of business men and lawyers, unfamiliar with the actual problems of education, that made concentration of power and responsibility obviously necessary. This had become the case in the administration of Dr. Stillé, but the less advanced members of the Board had not yet become convinced of it, and that somewhat petulant critic of things as they were, the Provost, was not skilled in reaching his ends by patience and consideration; so his work was dropped half done. Time, however, was on the side of his ideas, and shortly after his resignation the Board, on the recommendation of one of its committees, adopted a series of amendments to the by-laws which practically introduced all the changes Dr. Stillé had so vainly sought, and so made the provostship a new and vastly more efficient office.

The significance of the change justifies a somewhat full quotation from the by-laws, as amended:

The Provost shall be the chief executive officer of the Board of Trustees in the absence of the Governor, and shall have the right of offering resolutions and speaking on all questions that may come before the Board, and shall be *ex-officio* a member of all standing committees.

He shall be a member of and President of each Faculty, and when present at a Faculty meeting shall preside thereat, and may call a special meeting of any Faculty when he may deem the same expedi-

ent. He shall be the organ of communication between each Faculty and the several members thereof and the Board of Trustees. . . . He shall in all cases affecting the government and instruction have full and exclusive authority, subject only to the Board of Trustees, and as the chief executive officer of the University shall be obeyed and respected accordingly.

There is little reason to believe that Phillips Brooks, who was offered election as Provost but declined, would have filled the office effectively; Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, who was sounded out as a possible candidate, in view of his later expression that what the University needed was an autocrat, would probably have driven with too tight a rein. The great work that has been since achieved has been achieved through leadership and coöperation, not through the exercise of autocratic power. There was available in Philadelphia, however, now that the Provost was to be a real head of the University, the ideal man for the position. This was Dr. William Pepper. In the prime of life, but thirty-eight, a graduate of the College in the class of 1862 and of the Medical School two years later, active as an alumnus of both schools and a professor in the latter, possessing a good private practice as a physician, of distinguished appearance, well-to-do, and with good social connections, there was scarcely a qualification for the position he did not possess. He had made many addresses and written various reports on the border line between medical and more general social interests, and had shown executive ability in taking charge as medical director of the sanitary department of the Centennial Exposition of 1876. Moreover, he had already shown his ability in just that direction in which the most immediate need of the University lay. He had been the moving spirit from 1871 to 1874 in securing the land from the city and the funds from the state and individuals necessary for the building and endowment of the University Hospital. Therefore when he was mentioned for the position and it was known that, given the recent legislation concerning its powers, he would accept, he was elected by a unanimous vote.

Dr. Pepper's administration as Provost, lasting from 1881 to 1894, was one of the most notable in the history of the University. It was marked by the establishment of thirteen new departments,

several of them each almost a college in itself. It is not to be understood that the Provost created all, or perhaps any, of these new departments. It was rather his amazing responsiveness to new ideas, his ready perception of their value and practicability, the encouragement he gave to their advocates and the enthusiasm with which he impressed them upon the Board of Trustees and the community that made him such an effective head and his period as Provost perhaps the most constructive in the history of the University.¹

Much of this influence will appear in the brief outline of these foundations that will fill the next few paragraphs; the more general movements of the period will follow.

THE EARLY YEARS OF THE WHARTON SCHOOL

Provost Pepper was able in his inaugural address of February 22, 1881, to announce the donation of a sum of \$100,000 from Joseph Wharton of Philadelphia for the foundation of a new school, a school of business. Medical and law schools had become familiar; there were schools of dentistry, of engineering, of science, of agriculture; but as yet there was not in the United States, or indeed elsewhere, an institution of collegiate grade that made preparation for the higher ranks in the financial, commercial, banking, transportation, or manufacturing world its special objective. The vision of such a school had come to Mr. Wharton in the midst of an active and successful business career, and he now offered to establish it under the aegis of the University. His offer was presented to the Trustees at their meeting of March 1, 1881, in a letter accompanied by a printed project of a "School of Finance and Economy" which became the basic plan of the school which bears his name.

The offer was accepted by the Trustees and referred to a special committee of the Arts Faculty which, after conference with Mr. Wharton, drew up an arrangement of courses, a statement of objects, and a selection of professors, which were published in the University catalogues of 1881-82 and 1882-83 and in a special

¹ The character and achievements of Dr. Pepper are perhaps rather too exuberantly told in F. N. Thorpe, *William Pepper, M.D.*, Philadelphia, 1904.

circular. Robert Ellis Thompson was Dean and J. G. R. McElroy Secretary of the Faculty. This was the first collegiate establishment of its sort, and no other appeared for seventeen years, until in 1898 similar schools were founded in the Universities of Chicago and California.

The first Faculty was composed of men in the departments of Arts and Science; it was not until 1883 that a group of new men, Edmund J. James, Albert S. Bolles, and John Bach McMaster, were elected and formed a genuine Wharton School Faculty. In 1888 Simon N. Patten was brought in as Professor of Economics. These four were a notable group, laying the foundation of the new school in much the same way as the four University of Edinburgh graduates had inaugurated the Medical School something more than a century before, and as similar groups are looked back to as the "founding fathers" of various other departments of the University. Professor James, a graduate of the University of Illinois, came directly from taking his doctor's degree in political science in Germany. He was full of enthusiasm for the introduction of a new group of interests into the University and into the staid civic life of Philadelphia. For thirteen years he was the leading force in the new school, and fathered or supported many outside projects germane to the general educational objects of the University, though not directly under its control. University Extension, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, with its widely circulated publication, the *Annals*, and other old and new organizations either owed their inception to him or long felt his directing hand.

Dr. Patten was an economist of much originality and distinction, a natural-born teacher and intellectual leader, especially attracting advanced students. He was the constant center of wholesome economic and social dispute, and raised a whole generation of disciples who became men of influence.

Professor John B. McMaster was to a certain extent a man of mystery. Educated as an engineer, member of a United States government survey unit in the far west just after the close of the Civil War, he was more impressed with the empire-building going on at that time in that region than in the political events of the past. He determined therefore at this early date to write

a history to be occupied with the domestic and peaceful interests of the American people. Self-trained, so far as the writing of history was concerned, except for his reading, and engaged in teaching mathematics at Princeton, he worked in obscurity and silence for five years, then produced the first volume of the *History of the People of the United States*, destined to extend to eight volumes, to occupy him for twenty-five years and to achieve great popularity. It was a new kind of history, interesting itself in whatever the people of the times about which he wrote were interested in, and drawing its materials from contemporary sources previous historians had seldom thought of using. The first volume, which appeared in 1883, had an immediate success, and American history being an evident need of the Wharton School, he was promptly invited to leave Princeton and his mathematics and to come to Pennsylvania as Professor of American History, the successor, after a half-century's interval, of Henry and William B. Reed. Here he remained for the rest of his teaching and writing life, his success in the latter, it may be said, being greater than in the former. Professor Bolles, the third member of the original Wharton School Faculty, was a man of much experience in journalism and in business and was called to teach banking and commerce.

Under these men and some colleagues drawn from the other faculties, a four-year course was established, although for some years the students spent the first two years in classes elected from the general College course, spending only the junior and senior years in courses connected with the objects of the Wharton School. After 1894 the whole four years were occupied with courses adapted more or less closely to those objects. These objects, according to Mr. Wharton's ideas, which have been followed in the main through the whole existence of the school, were threefold, preparation for business in its various forms, preparation for public service, and preparation for the management of property.

Alongside of the thread of general culture and devotion to professional preparation there was, naturally, much attention given to knowledge and investigation of matters of general social and historical interest. These two ideals, professional training

and general cultural interest, though not necessarily opposed or even incompatible, represent a difference in emphasis, and this double conception of the school has always been present, sometimes one object predominating, sometimes the other. Like the Law School, the Wharton School is at the same time a professional school and an opportunity to cultivate a special field of higher intellectual interest.

The first degree given by the school, in 1884, was Bachelor of Finance. For the next ten years the degrees depended on the department in which the student had taken his first two years. After the prolongation of the course in 1894, the regular degree was Bachelor of Science in Economics.

The new and somewhat vociferous educational activity introduced into the University by the first group of teachers in the Wharton School and their corresponding efforts to wake up Philadelphia outside its halls, though looked on with favor by Provost Pepper, were much less heartily approved of by some of their older and more conservative colleagues and some members of the Board of Trustees. As a result serious friction developed. This friction was connected somewhat obscurely with the controversies that arose in 1892 concerning Professor Robert Ellis Thompson and in 1896 concerning Professor James. Professor Thompson, a native son of the University, of the class of 1865, was one of the most brilliant, admired, and useful men on the University Faculty and in the community of Philadelphia, and the revered master of this writer. In March 1892 it was rumored in the newspapers that the Trustees of the University were about to remove Thompson from his professorship. This news had "leaked" from the Board against its intention. It appears that a committee of the Board, reflecting dissatisfaction with conditions at the University, had brought in, March 24, 1892, a report proposing what was then possible, though it would not have been in the colonial College and would not be now, immediately "dispensing with the services" of Professor Thompson, three other professors, and two instructors, reorganizing certain departments and abolishing one.¹

¹ The constitutions of 1749 provided that no professor could be removed except after two admonitions from the Board; and the present Statutes allow of removals of professors only on petition of a Faculty, and give abundant opportunity for

This recommendation was approved by the Board, and the Provost was directed to ask Professor Thompson and the others for their resignations. In the meantime the proposal had become public. Older alumni will remember the active campaign of opposition to Thompson's removal; the visits of angry graduates to the Board of Trustees to protest against their proposed action; the articles in the newspapers, the interviews and published protests. Professor Thompson, notwithstanding his twenty-five years of service on the Faculty, had undoubtedly laid himself open to serious criticism by his devotion of so large a part of his time and interest to occupations outside of the University. He was a regular editorial writer on at least two weekly papers, he lectured in other institutions and preached frequently, he hurried away from the University after his classes. He was chargeable not only with neglecting his college teaching but with being non-coöperative with the Wharton School and other new educational enterprises then being undertaken in the University; a committee reports that he "cannot or will not work to advantage with others." It is true also that the type of scholarship and teaching in which he had been brought up and in which he excelled was giving place to more specialized and fundamental studies with which he had scant sympathy. Whether that change was good for college boys or not, who knows?

Under pressure the Trustees offered to retain him in the Faculty to give courses on the English Bible, church history, and industrial and elementary history, but would not agree to his retention of the more responsible position, the John Welsh Centennial Professorship of History and English Literature, to which he had been appointed on the resignation of Dr. Stillé ten years before. This offer he rejected, stating his lack of preparation for that work and denying the right of the Board to remove him or to reorganize his department without consultation with him and without previous complaint about his work. His requests for the reasons for his dismissal made in two successive letters remained unanswered. By this time the matter had become a test of strength between the

hearing and answering the charges against the person concerned. The whole matter of removals of professors has, in addition, been subjected to the regulations of a national organization, accepted by all reputable universities and colleges.

Provost, supported by the Board, and Professor Thompson and his supporters among the Trustees, the alumni, and in the community. A contest had arisen and neither side would give way. It was part of the price of the new provostship that the Provost was practically an autocrat, and autocrats do not yield except to revolution. The affair was reminiscent of that incident in the very early history of the College when, as will be remembered, the Trustees removed David James Dove, a distant predecessor of Professor Thompson as a teacher of English, but only after pointing out to him the reasons for their dissatisfaction. After various reports and discussions, the report of the committee recommending his removal from the John Welsh chair was, in June 1892, accepted by the Trustees by a vote of nineteen to three. By this vote he ceased to be a member of the University Faculty. One of the Trustees who had voted with the minority thereupon resigned. Five of the living sons and daughters of John Welsh joined in a letter to Professor Thompson, dated June 13, 1892, expressing their admiration for him and regretting his removal from the chair founded in their father's name.

Professor Thompson was, naturally, much embittered. He felt that he had been cast out by his own people. He had been, except for his Ulster boyhood, a Philadelphian all his life, a protectionist, a strong defender of the national policy to which most of the successful business men of Philadelphia, directly or indirectly, owed their wealth, passionately attached to his city, his state, and his college, a preacher in many Presbyterian pulpits, and a speaker on many platforms. He never forgave the University, making little discrimination, in fact, between those who had been responsible for his removal and those who had fought against it.

A few years later, in 1896, much the same conflict arose concerning Professor James. It was even more obscure in its causes, arising largely no doubt from incompatibility of personalities, ideas, and methods at a time of rapid change and much innovation. Professor James was asked to resign. He was not so vigorously defended and his feeling was not so deep as Professor Thompson's; his departure was the occasion of a dinner of farewell given by his friends in which no personal or University bitterness was

expressed. Both Thompson and James subsequently lived lives of distinction and influence: Thompson, after refusal of the Presidency of Northwestern University, as President of the Philadelphia High School through the period of its great extension; James as professor at the University of Chicago, then as President successively of Northwestern University and the University of Illinois. The departure of both was a serious and unnecessary loss to the University; it has not had any too many men of their stature, and neither need have gone if greater reasonableness had been exerted.

Although Professor Patten was a man of recognized position as an economist, an excellent teacher, a prolific writer, and frequent participant in public discussions, and drew much attention to the University, this attention was not always favorable nor was it welcome to men of conservative views. There was no crisis in his relations to the institution, but there was an evident readiness to bring his connection with it to an end promptly when he had reached sixty-five, which was then the early age of retirement. This occurred in 1917.

Notwithstanding the specific objects for which the Wharton School had been founded, it was general rather than professional training that predominated during its early years. This may have been due to the fact that there were as yet so few textbooks or outlines for study of applied economics, sociology, and political science; it was partly the result of the relatively small number of courses of a technical nature given and the dependence of the school on members of other faculties. This was presumably the reason that so many of the early graduates attained prominent positions on boards of trustees, faculties, and in administrative offices rather than in business. Such were Mr. Samuel F. Houston of the Board of Trustees of the University, President Gates, Secretary Mumford, the devoted alumnus Henry LaBarre Jayne, Professors Cheyney, Witmer, Lindsay, and Stewart, Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Leo S. Rowe of the Pan American Union, Robert Adams, member of the United States House of Representatives, Shiro Shiba, a Japanese who was subsequently a member of the ministry, and many later Japanese and Chinese, apart from the

long list of subsequent graduates who have attained eminence.

From the opening of the second decade of the school not only were additions made to the staff in general subjects, but appointments were made and courses introduced of a more technical nature, belonging to the directly professional object of the school. Such were transportation, banking, insurance, corporation finance, real estate, brokerage, industry, accounting, statistics, and other courses of a vocational character. It was in this second decade that the large numbers that have been a distinctive characteristic of the Wharton School began to appear. In 1894 there were 113 students in the school, a decade later there were twice as many, and the increase continued steadily until the Wharton School became, as it has since remained, the largest department in the University. This was the result, no doubt, partly of the widespread appeal this group of subjects made to young men, partly to the ability of its Faculty, partly to the practice, instituted in 1902, of frequent and systematic announcements of the opportunities the school offered.

For many years the Wharton School, notwithstanding its distinctive name, was but incompletely discriminated from the general College Faculty; it was merely one group of courses in the College. In 1904, on account presumably of the more professional character of the school, its Faculty was made a separate self-directing body and the Chairman of the group was made Director, an office occupied long and with distinction by Dr. James T. Young, a Wharton School graduate of the class of 1893, and, like so many of the early professors, also a Ph.D. from a German university. Later the director became Dean. The expanding spirit of the Wharton School led to the establishment in 1904 of the Evening School of Accounts and Finance at the University and, later, of the Extension School of Accounts and Finance. This group gave courses in several Wharton School subjects at five selected cities in central Pennsylvania. These courses, both those in the city and those in the state, available to ambitious young men occupied in business in the daytime, proved to be attractive to a large number of students not less loyal to the University than those who take courses for four years on the campus.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

One of the distinctive characteristics of the modern university is the large proportion of its attention that it gives to graduate studies. This is largely due to the influence of Germany—the old Germany, interested in scholarship, not dominated by nationalism. American students going abroad were fascinated with the lectures of men who drew their knowledge directly from the sources, who were specialists in their fields and counted on a considerable degree of maturity in their students. The professors in the German universities had worked out the seminar system by which students as well as themselves came in contact with the raw materials of their subjects and shared the methods of study of their instructors. Even those who did not go abroad were affected indirectly by the influence of these methods. So there grew up among both teachers and students the desire to pursue postgraduate work. This took its clearest shape at Pennsylvania in what was known as the Department of Philosophy, since it was analogous to the German philosophical faculty and, like it, should lead to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

It is true that this degree, as we have seen, had been given from 1870 to 1880 to graduates of another department, the group of Courses Auxiliary to Medicine. Even these, however, were post-graduate courses, leading to the degree only after graduation from the Medical School; and among the courses were several of a liberal cultural character. Moreover, the grant of these degrees had been abolished November 4, 1879, so the way was now open for drawing together the desired advanced courses and giving to graduates in them the degree, since so familiar and so coveted, of Ph.D. It should in future be the result of prolonged study and some research. The approval by the Trustees of the formation of a Faculty of Philosophy and its grant of this degree was given March 1881; a tentative plan, presented by the Faculty of Arts in May, was adopted by the Trustees in December, and in November 1882, professors in thirteen subjects, all of them already on the University's staff, were appointed to constitute the Faculty. A meeting of several of these was held at the home of Provost Pepper, December 8, 1882, where the Graduate School may be said to

have been founded. Professor Edmund J. James was the leading spirit and became Secretary of the Faculty tentatively organized. He remained in that position for six years. The veteran Professor E. Otis Kendall was Dean. The new department was announced in the catalogue of 1882-83 and in a circular issued in 1884. This circular announced both instruction and examination for the degree in eight subjects, and examination for the degree in three others.

In 1887 an Executive Committee was appointed, and it thus became a recognized separate school, though its Faculty was made up entirely of men who were at the same time professors in Arts and Sciences and in the Wharton School. The first really active Dean, who superseded Professor Kendall in 1888, was Professor George S. Fullerton, College '79, one of the most able of the younger men on the Faculty at this time. He had not studied in Germany, but his postgraduate study in divinity at Princeton and Yale, and his German philosophical reading gave him much the same interest in postgraduate and research work that others had brought back with them from abroad. His prominence as Dean of the College and Vice-Provost will come up later. In the meantime his work for the Graduate School, along with his keen Socratic method of teaching philosophy that perplexed, awakened, and delighted his undergraduate students, along with his use of hypnotism, was his principal interest. His successors as Dean in the first ten years of the School's existence were Professors Lamberton and Newbold.

The Faculty grew slowly, by invitation, from those who were already giving courses, or from the Dean, or by offers to give graduate courses approved by Dean, Executive Committee, and Board of Trustees. Most of the older professors were uninterested in graduate teaching, but a generation of younger men grew up to whom membership in the Graduate Faculty was their principal ambition. After ten years there were some twenty fields in which seminars or graduate lecture courses were offered. The student body grew, at first, even more slowly. The first students were enrolled in the winter of 1885-86. Among the first to be enrolled—two men and two women—and the first to receive his degree in course at Pennsylvania was Arthur W. Goodspeed, sub-

sequently for many years head of the Department of Physics at the University. At the end of the first ten years there were still only forty or fifty enrolled at any one time. Men and women were admitted on equal terms, and a body of superior women students who, not admitted as undergraduates at Pennsylvania, had taken their undergraduate work at other institutions were thus introduced into the University. The registration of women was somewhat complicated by the organization of the Graduate School for Women in 1892; but as all their work was taken in the Department of Philosophy, it was largely a distinction without a difference. Chemistry with its forty men taking degrees, history with its twenty-five, English with its twenty-one, and economics with its twenty were the leading witnesses to the need for a graduate school.

The first considerable extension of the field of action of the school was its taking over from the departments of Arts and Science of the granting of the degrees of M.A. and M.S. This was done by the Trustees at the request of the Graduate Faculty, through the intermediation of the College Faculty in 1887. Instead of the traditional grant of M.A. by the College Faculty automatically to A.B. graduates of three years' standing, as inherited from England, or the somewhat modified system of recent years, the two Masters' degrees were now to be given by the Graduate Faculty only after the candidate had devoted at least a year to close and continuous study, followed by a rigorous examination. The M.A. has been an uneasy companion to the Ph.D. degree. The latter is primarily a research degree, laying stress on acquiring knowledge and training by working with the primary sources in a particular field, and it therefore requires specialization. The M.A. degree had no such suggestion of originality, although in recent years it had not been given even by the College without some proof of study during the three years, usually the preparation of a thesis. Yet its ideal was rather the continuation of acquisition of knowledge by methods already familiar to the undergraduate than work of a different order carried on by new methods. The courses for the M.A., however, became extremely popular, being the standard preparation for high school and undergraduate college teaching. The special significance of that

degree has been a subject of frequent question, and the inclusion of preparation for it has held back the Graduate School from declaring itself, as many members of its faculty have desired, purely a school of research.

For the next serious advance in the history of the Graduate School we must pass somewhat beyond Provost Pepper's administration into that of his successor. Scholarships and fellowships were an especial desideratum in the Graduate School. Students of an age beyond that to which a parent's support is expected to extend, preparing for a career that offers few probabilities of large reward, possessed often of abilities and ambitions out of all proportion to their means to develop them, and sometimes unfortunately already burdened with family cares—such students must often have assistance if the community is to have the benefit of long training of competent scholars. In recognition of this need there were from the foundation of this school students who held fellowships in it and took its courses, though their titles were often in the College. Such, for instance, was the Hector Tyndale Fellowship, endowed in 1885 by Professor John Tyndale in memory of his father out of the proceeds of his American lecture tour, the two Mrs. Bloomfield Moore Fellowships for women who expect to become teachers, and several others.

It was because he was impressed by these conditions that in June 1895 Mr. Charles C. Harrison made a gift of \$500,000 to the Graduate School "as a filial memorial" to his father, much the largest benefaction the University had received up to that time, and since by accumulation brought to more than a million dollars. "The George Leib Harrison Foundation for the Encouragement of Liberal Studies and the Advancement of Knowledge," to give the endowment its full and descriptive name, will be more fully described later, but it may be noted here that it endowed, according to its initial establishment, eight scholarships, fourteen fellowships, and five post-doctoral fellowships for research in addition to its other provisions, and thus supplied a constant nucleus of superior students.¹

¹ See a series of articles by W. R. Newbold in *Old Penn*, 1912 and 1913, beginning with p. 805.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Attention has been called to the two strains of scientific interest long existent in the University, the cultural and the practical. The establishment of the School of Biology at the University in 1884 was the culmination of a long series of efforts to embody the former, especially the interest in botany and zoölogy, in some kind of separate department or group of studies. A department of Natural History had existed in 1816-1827; a department of the Natural Sciences was provided for, but ineffectively, in a resolution of the Board of Trustees, May 6, 1856; professorships of botany and natural history had taken various forms from time to time. But no attempts at organization had been successful until the more favorable conditions of the period we have now reached had appeared. Among these were the interest of some Philadelphia women in zoölogy, the return of Dr. Horace Jayne, College '79, Medicine '82, from his studies in that subject in England and Germany, and, as in all other departments, the sympathetic interest of Provost Pepper.

The story is told that a Miss Fields, a missionary to China, had there become interested in ants and on her return to Philadelphia wished to pursue their study further. She applied to Dr. Leidy, then at the Academy of Natural Sciences, but finding no facilities there, spoke of the matter to various persons, among them to Mrs. Bloomfield Moore, a woman of position and means who had already made liberal gifts to the University for the education of women, and to Dr. Harrison Allen, Professor of Comparative Anatomy in the Auxiliary Faculty of Medicine. Dr. Allen on this suggestion wrote a vigorous article in one of the magazines appealing for the establishment in Philadelphia of a biological institute.

The old local interest in botany could always be counted on, and several zoölogists were now available. The most noted was Dr. Joseph Leidy, who had been for many years Professor of Anatomy in the Medical School, and had already attained wide fame for his original work in natural history. He was also President of the Academy of Natural Sciences. Dr. Jayne, who has been referred to above, had wealth as well as interest in the subject,

and secured the interest of Dr. Pepper. Courses of study were offered. Dr. Jayne provided the largest part of a fund of \$100,000 with which the gaunt brick building which is now so thrown into the shade by its more modern companions was erected. Biological Hall, as it was called, was opened December 4, 1884. Soon a class of ten men and two women were at work as students, and three zoölogists and two botanists were developing lecture and laboratory courses for their benefit.

As in so many departments of the University, a specially notable group of teachers and investigators surrounded its earlier years. Does the effort involved in bringing a new school to the birth develop special ability in its group of founders? Or is the selective process by which they are gathered a specially rigorous one? Or does the inbreeding so likely to occur in later years weaken the stock (though biological teaching tends to discredit that old belief)? At any rate the tradition concerning the past that "there were giants in those days" is a persistent one, and it is as applicable to the men who founded the Biological Department as to the founders of the Medical School, the Wharton School, the Department of Philosophy and elsewhere. Certainly the group that included as zoölogists Leidy, Cope, Harrison Allen, Jayne, Dolley, and Ryder, and as botanists Rothrock, Macfarlane, and Wilson, was probably unequaled in the United States at that time.

There were from the beginning three notable characteristics of the Biological Department; it was open to men and women alike, students learned through actual observation and experiment, using individual microscopes and living material, and it was much given to research. As to coeducation, much of the interest that led to the formation of the school was on the part of women; the school was new, with no hampering masculine traditions to bind it, and both Dr. Leidy and Dr. Dolley, through their connection with Swarthmore, were used to mixed classes. Dr. Jayne, its first Director, had worked in biology alongside of women in England and Germany; Dolley, besides, was son of Dr. Sarah Adams, one of the first women physicians and feminists in the United States, and naturally therefore inclined in its favor.

As to observational methods of work, they were made more

practicable by aquaria and greenhouses and for a while by the gift in 1890 by Charles K. Landis of a tract of beach and marsh land which became the school's laboratory of marine biology at Sea Isle City, N.J., where study and collection, research and experimentation were carried on for some years with great interest. But such an establishment was extremely expensive, and the connections of professors and advanced students with the far better equipped and longer established marine station at Wood's Hole, Massachusetts, were so close that the effort to support the New Jersey institution was after ten years discontinued. The third characteristic of the school, the extent to which it encouraged research, was by this time becoming a marked tendency through the whole University; but earlier than in most departments the interests of its teachers and students were devoted to investigation and experiment. This led to the adoption early in its career of the practice of providing each year for the absence of one member of its staff who might be engaged in an extensive piece of research.

As a department, although but a part of the College, it was successful from the beginning in attracting students; its fundamental course in zoölogy became one of the most popular though one of the most rigorous elective courses for undergraduates. At first only a two-year course was given, as the anticipation was that, except for special and advanced students, its appeal would only be as a course preparatory for medicine; but as it became evident that there would be a larger constituency, in 1894 a four-year course was arranged and the consent of the Trustees was obtained, not without protests from the older departments, for the grant of a new degree, Bachelor of Science in Biology to men and women alike. Except in the course in music, this was the first opportunity offered by the University for a woman to obtain a regular undergraduate degree, and so was doubtless made use of by women of good mental parts and college ambitions but not of any special interest in biology. Even more advanced courses offered in biological fields were taken by students enrolled in the Graduate School, and a lengthening list of men who had taken their degrees of Ph.D. at Pennsylvania appeared on other faculties.

Early in its career the Biological School revived the old project

of a botanical garden, neglected since its failure in the early nineteenth century and the destruction of its second effort by the building program on Ninth Street. In the will of Dr. George B. Wood, who died in 1879, there were provisions that might admit of this use of the fund, and the Faculty of the Biological School applied for the legacy in 1885. The Trustees acquiesced, assigned the use of some ground near the building, appropriated a small sum for its establishment, and elected Professor Macfarlane Director. From that time forward for a number of years the University's Botanical Garden was alternately encouraged and neglected. At one time, in 1895, it was laid out with several thousand plants and a number of trees, and with its seven acres of ground compared with the Harvard Botanic Garden and the Shaw Gardens at St. Louis. But like so many other plans that required money, the Botanical Garden dragged along, a burden on the School of Biology; it was only the teaching of the school that flourished.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR WOMEN

It was a characteristic of these new departments, as they were successively established, that they were in most cases open to women as well as men. It was not unnatural that the adventurous spirit that led to the creation of a new field of instruction should make that instruction available to both sexes. It was thus with the Department of Music, which the Catalogue of 1875-76 describes as offering lectures on the science of music "to such persons . . . male or female as may desire systematic instruction in this subject." It was so with the Graduate School, founded in 1882, which, like other graduate schools in America and abroad, made no discrimination of sex in advanced study. It was so, as has been seen, in the School of Biology, opened in the fall of 1884.

But the infiltration of women into the University had already begun at other points. It was curiously interwoven with the old Charity School. It will be remembered that from the circumstances of its origin and the requirements of its charter the University was bound to carry on a free school for boys and one for girls. As late as 1875 the boys' school was kept up in the old build-

ings at Fourth and Arch streets, the girls' in another building in the neighborhood, with three teachers and a total of more than a hundred pupils. The greater prominence of the Academy, the College, and the University has diverted attention from these schools, but they had their place in the history of elementary education and it has been estimated that they had nurtured more than fifteen thousand pupils. More than once the Trustees had proposed to divest themselves of the responsibility for maintaining them, but it had always proved too deeply imbedded in their charter and traditions to be disturbed. By 1875, however, when free education was publicly provided for all children, the need for this function had disappeared and the fitness of the University for its performance was doubtful. The question of its abandonment was raised again in 1877, and a carefully constructed judicial committee of the Board of Trustees advised that the University might consider itself freed from this requirement of the charter on condition that it give certain scholarships to poor boys and that it should, so far as practicable under existing conditions, also provide instruction to "indigent female students."

This requirement was, so far as girls were concerned, fulfilled in a resolution of September 1877 allowing women applicants to attend certain courses in Arts and the recently organized Towne Scientific School, though of course as special students only, not as candidates for degrees; nor were their names to be printed in the Catalogue. Therefore women were, from 1877 onward, allowed to attend the lectures in modern history given by Provost Stillé himself, and courses in chemistry and physics. February 16, 1878, Dr. Stillé writes to a friend, "You will be glad to learn that my lectures on History are attended regularly by about twenty-five ladies, who seem much interested." It is within the memory of the present writer that in the lectures on physics in 1881 two young women sat meekly in a distant corner while Professor Barker was describing the new inventions of the electric light and telephone.

In the next year, 1878, the Auxiliary Faculty of Medicine, learning of this action, obtained authority from the Board of Trustees to "permit the attendance of ladies" in certain courses, under the same conditions as obtained in the Scientific School. Since the Auxiliary Faculty regularly granted degrees to those

who attended its courses and possessed the medical degree, they conferred in 1880 their usual degree of Ph.D. on Mary Alice Bennett, who had already received an M.D. from the Women's Medical College and had attended these courses two years. Hers was the first degree given by the University to a woman. In 1878 Mrs. Bloomfield Moore, a wealthy and philanthropic literary woman of Philadelphia, gave a sum of \$15,000 to endow six scholarships for women who intended to become teachers, to be used in obtaining what education might be allowed them in the University.

These were all voluntary concessions offered by the University to women students. During the same period a frontal attack was being made by women themselves. The best known and most effective was that of Mrs. Caroline B. Kilgore. The first woman to obtain the degree of M.D. in the state of New York, Mrs. Kilgore, having in 1871 transferred her residence and her ambitions to Pennsylvania, applied for admission as a student in the Law School. She was refused. She then studied privately and in 1873 applied to the Pennsylvania Board of Examiners for admission to the bar. True to the standards of their profession the Board refused to examine her on the ground that there was "no precedent for examination of a woman for admission to the bar." She applied to the State Supreme Court, but, although the Chief Justice complimented her on her argument, he also denied her appeal. In 1881, however, the state Legislature passed a bill giving women admission to the legal profession. Mrs. Kilgore appeared in its support. She thereupon applied anew for admission to the University Law School, was accepted, and in due course, in 1883, received her degree of Bachelor of Laws. She practised her profession in Philadelphia for the remainder of her life. The ice was broken, a precedent created; the Law School has since 1881 been regularly open to women students.

During the next two years a somewhat similar contest was being waged by a Mrs. Hyems for admission to the Medical School. She had a letter of recommendation from Dr. H. C. Wood, but her application was not acceptable, the Board of Trustees giving its decision January 3, 1882, that "it is not at present expedient to admit women to this School." The Faculty of the Medical School expressed their agreement with this decision. There must

have been something contagious in feminine ambition at this time, for in September 1882 a Miss Ida C. Craddock contrived to have herself examined among the students applying for admission to the freshman class of the Department of Arts, and passed a satisfactory examination. The Faculty of that Department referred the question of her admission to the Board of Trustees and by a vote of five to four recommended that she be admitted, but the Trustees decided otherwise. October 31, 1882, on motion of Bishop Stevens, it was resolved that "the Board of Trustees deem it inexpedient at this time to admit any women to the Department of Arts." Miss Craddock for the next two years repeatedly pressed her claim to admission to what she considered her class.

Early in 1882 the Faculty of the Dental School, taking a different view from that of the Medical Faculty, called the attention of the Trustees to the number of women who were coming to this country from Europe for the purpose of studying dentistry, and recommended that such persons be admitted to their department. The Trustees again gave an adverse decision. A few months later, February 1883, a thoroughgoing petition was presented, signed by a number of persons asking that all instruction in the University be opened to women on the same terms as men, and there were various applications from women for admission as special students in the Department of Arts. Somewhat later the Wharton School Faculty asked to have women admitted to certain courses. The College Faculty on September 30, 1889, proposed, in a resolution to which there were only two dissenting votes, admission of students "without distinction of sex" to all departments of the College. At the same time the senior class, representing the immemorial opposition of the undergraduates to the admission of girls, protested against any plan of coeducation. There were rumors of similar opposition from the alumni. In the Board of Trustees Mr. Fraley introduced a motion favoring the resolution of the College Faculty, but it was voted down.

All this interest could not be disregarded, and through 1882 and 1883 there was still much discussion. Interested committees held repeated meetings at the house of Mr. Fraley, one of the most sympathetic members of the Board. Mr. Welsh had also returned from England full of the discussion of the subject he had heard

there and delighted with visits he had made in Cambridge to the women's colleges of Girton and Nuneham. To show that they were not opposed to women's education in general the Trustees in November 1882 adopted a resolution providing that a separate college for women, exactly parallel to the existing Department of Arts for men, should be established as soon as sufficient funds were attainable, \$300,000 being suggested as the minimum amount required. No such sum was in sight. There was little spirit behind this proposal, the only immediate suggestion being for the establishment of such a college in the old buildings at Fourth and Arch streets, recently abandoned by the Charity Schools. There was evidently strong opposition to the admission of women to the College proper, and no very serious desire on the part of the administration of the University to extend its responsibilities to the field of women's education in any form.

From outside, however, came a call for a new step. Joseph M. Bennett, a Philadelphia merchant, of his own volition donated to the University the two tall dwelling houses which some readers will remember as standing at Thirty-fourth and Walnut streets immediately opposite the University. He explained that they were "to be occupied for the purpose of a College for Women." He stated his belief in the higher education of women, though not in complete coeducation. Unfortunately Colonel Bennett did not realize how expensive a matter the endowment of a college is and, although he later added further gifts, including the six adjacent houses, and bequeathed to the University his moderate fortune, it was many years before this nucleus grew into even a considerable building fund, quite apart from endowment. The proposed gift called, however, for some immediate action. There was evidently much popular interest in the subject. Provost Pepper had, on this as on other matters, grown far more liberal since his tepid references to women's education in his inaugural address of 1881. Repeatedly in the later years of his administration he spoke with real warmth of the large part it was desirable that women should play in public life, and even expressed his approval of coeducation elsewhere, though he was not ready to introduce it in his own institution.

Another possibility thereupon emerged and became a favorite

idea of the Provost, a Women's Graduate School. A faculty was ready to hand in the professors in the Graduate School, already including in their lecture courses and seminars women as well as men. Colonel Bennett's gift provided at least for a woman's building as an administrative and social center. It might sidetrack the demand for genuine coeducation. Early in 1890, therefore, plans for a Graduate School for Women were adopted, and a Board of Managers, largely recruited, as in other cases, from outside the University, was provided for. Colonel Bennett made further donations of money, the Bloomfield Moore scholarships were changed into fellowships, thus securing the eight endowed fellowships required by the Trustees before the Bennett Hall of that time could be opened. In a dignified ceremony, held on May 4, 1892, in the open room of the new Library, the Graduate Department for Women was inaugurated, with addresses by the Provost, the venerable William H. Furness, the President of Bryn Mawr College, and the newly appointed Director of Drexel Institute, itself a successful coeducational institution.

Yet notwithstanding the sanguine tone of these addresses the Graduate School for Women was really but a shadow department. Women were already admitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences on the same terms as this department offered, and it had no separate faculty. It satisfied neither the advocates of general coeducation nor those who hoped for a separate undergraduate college for women. It was at best but a compromise, providing fuller recognition, pleasanter surroundings, and some support for a group of graduate women students, but doing nothing to settle the question of admission of women to the College. Nor did anything of importance immediately follow. The growth of interest in women's education at Pennsylvania came largely to a rest for a period of more than twenty years. What was done during this time came automatically without much thought and can better be noted later.

On the whole there was little enthusiasm in high places for women's education at the University. It is probable that an opportunity was then lost. If at this time or during the two languid decades that followed there had been any real sympathy by the authorities with the higher education of women, and any serious

wish that it should be taken up by the University, there is little doubt that among the enlightened, wealthy, and generous women of Philadelphia someone or some group would have been found ready to furnish the endowment for a genuine college for women in connection with the University, as Barnard had been established at Columbia in 1889 and Radcliffe was to be attached to Harvard the next year, and such as was adumbrated here in 1882.

THE FOUNDING OF THE VETERINARY SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL

There has always been an interest in Philadelphia and even in the University in diseases of animals and their cure. In 1806 the Philadelphia Agricultural Society offered a gold medal for "The best plan for promoting veterinary knowledge." The next year Dr. Rush devoted the opening lecture of his regular course in the Medical School to the "Duties and Advantages of Studying the Diseases of Domestic Animals" and, deplored the fact that there was as yet no veterinary school in the United States, he appealed for the introduction of the teaching of veterinary science in the University. It was one of the branches provided for in the Faculty of Natural Science founded in 1816, but there is no indication of any actual teaching being given.

In November 1882, however, Mr. J. B. Lippincott the publisher, a Trustee, brought the matter to attention by donating \$10,000 as the beginning of an endowment for "establishing a veterinary department under the control of the University of Pennsylvania." This was soon doubled by the ready response of Provost, Trustees, and an interested clientèle. It is a good indication of the readiness for expansion of the University in this period of its history; for the work of this Department was far indeed from its old classical ideals. It was not so far from the ideals of Franklin, who would readily have included it in the "Skill in Agriculture" which he declared was "no disparagement to any." Nor is it a bad instance of "the active encouragement and sympathy with improvements whenever suggested which shall aid and support every project which may promise to enlarge the sphere or add to the reputation of the University," which Dr. Stillé would

so gladly have given if opportunity had been vouchsafed him.

As a matter of fact his successor, Provost Pepper, welcomed the gift and threw himself heartily into the plan, which soon obtained a building on the University grounds, later a hospital, an organized Faculty, a Dean; and thus it became a distinct department of the University. The school was opened October 1884 with an enrollment of twenty students, which grew until in modern times it has an entrance class each year restricted to fifty students. The interest in this Department of both Provost Pepper and his successor was especially deep and continuous. For Provost Pepper its work lay in the general sphere of the cure of disease to which his own life was dedicated, and Provost Harrison was impressed with its utilitarian value. As he says in his first report, and over and over again in his appeals to the Trustees for its support, "How wide a field of possible usefulness is open to our Veterinary Department,—a field which it has not yet begun to occupy." Mr. Lippincott during his lifetime, and his family after his death, continued to contribute liberally toward its support. In its tenth year it received a welcome endowment of \$100,000 from a woman sympathetic with its work.

It was notable, moreover, as being the first department, except the University Hospital, to obtain in modern times acknowledgment from the state of claims to support for its service to the community. In 1889 a grant of \$12,500 was made to the Veterinary Hospital for its research work in the diseases of animals, in 1905 \$100,000 for a suitable building for its uses and those of the State Livestock Sanitary Board, and in 1907 the state gave \$50,000 for maintenance purposes, the first step in what has become a recognized relation between the state and the University. With its hospital service, its specialized professional teaching, and research, the Veterinary School is perhaps the best example in the University of that direct practical service to the community to which all of its schools are more and more coming to conform.

FOUNDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

The establishment of the School of Architecture was, like that of the Law School, the Scientific School, and the Wharton School,

an effort to provide the training for a profession which could no longer be learned in the field, the workshop, the law office, or the counting house. The professions were offering greater opportunities and making higher demands upon those who entered them, but these demands could be met only by technical training. Architecture had been since 1874 one of the five parallel courses of the Scientific School. It was under Thomas W. Richards, who had been appointed Instructor in Drawing in 1869 and Professor of Architecture in 1874. As has been told, he designed the group of four greenstone buildings to which we have so often in this narrative had to return as the cradle of the new University in West Philadelphia.

Professor Richards had studied in the office of a Philadelphia architect and had practised in Philadelphia and Baltimore till the Civil War brought building to a close. He would gladly on this new occasion have followed another design if it had been permitted to him, and he found the material distasteful, but the available funds were exiguous and the authority of the building committee insistent, so we were left with buildings with more appeal to usefulness and the kindly familiarity of successive classes than to either dignity or beauty. There was small inspiration to architects in the surroundings of their studies. Professor Richards wished to broaden his subject, but the scanty facilities available made his course, before 1890, narrow and unsatisfactory.

A new influence, however, was during this period having the same effect on architecture in America that we have already seen transforming scholarship. This was travel and study in Europe. Young men who were graduated in architecture in this period went abroad and studied at the *École des Beaux Arts* in Paris, traveled and sketched and came back to America dissatisfied with the condition of architectural practice here, especially with the facilities for its study. There were by this time genuine architectural schools at Cornell, Syracuse, Illinois, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the course at Pennsylvania was obviously inadequate. As a result a group of young architects, several of whom had been abroad and had on their return formed the Philadelphia Chapter of the *American Institute of Architects*, urged the University to reorganize the teaching of architecture

and to establish a separate school in that subject. Dr. Pepper was as usual sympathetic, and October 7, 1890, the School of Architecture was opened under the active management of Theophilus P. Chandler, a successful Philadelphia architect, as Director, with Professor Richards as Secretary.

After one year Mr. Chandler retired and Warren P. Laird, a graduate of the Cornell School of Architecture, and at the time studying in Paris, was elected to head the new school; Professor Richards withdrew to carry on professional work. At first much of the teaching was by professors in scientific and academic subjects and by lectures given by practising architects, but within the next few years men trained in special phases were added. The school thrived and spread till it occupied a large part of College Hall. When in 1915 the Dental Department migrated to its new building the School of Architecture moved to its vacant building, which with some remodeling proved to be admirably suited to its purposes.

To an outside observer the Department of Architecture, now a division of the School of Fine Arts, seems a merry institution, giving from time to time departmental tableaux and balls in artistic character. On the other hand the lights in its drafting rooms burn all night when designs and decorations and ingenious plans are being worked out in competitions for national and international prizes.

PHYSICAL CULTURE AND ATHLETICS

What would the history of the University be with athletics left out? Yet of its four half-centuries it is only in the last that they have played any appreciable part. Even during this period the historian is at a loss whether to treat them as a matter of physical culture or as a form of student amusement. The earliest references are all in favor of the former. Franklin would have placed the College—"Academy" was the word he used—in the country, where "to keep the students in health and to strengthen and render active their bodies they should be frequently exercised in Running, Leaping, Wrestling and Swimming, etc." Almost a cen-

tury later, in 1831, Provost DeLancey advocates "connecting with the college some gymnastic exercises, either on college premises [the College was then on Ninth Street] or under college regulations at some other place," in order "to relieve our institution of a current charge of working the students too much for their health." A committee of the Trustees thereupon visited the gymnasium of a Mr. Roper and obtained from him an agreement to take students for an hour every day, to supervise their exercise himself in order to avoid accidents, and to charge them only \$10 a year instead of his usual price of \$20, if he could be guaranteed as many as seventy pupils. He was to have a connection with the University as Teacher of Gymnastics. After still another half or three-quarters of a century Dr. J. William White, speaking for the alumni in 1904, as he hands the new Gymnasium over to the Trustees speaks of it as "a laboratory for our Professor of Physical Education" and asserts that "its relation to competitive college sports is altogether subordinate in the minds of the Trustees, the Alumni and the Athletic Association to its hopes for usefulness in relation to health and education."

On the other hand no one who has gone into training, taken part in contests, or gathered with the crowd to watch a competitive game can believe athletics to be nothing more than an exhibition of the results of hygienic training. Athletics appeal to much more primitive human instincts. Probably the two objects, physical culture and pure sport, are inseparable, indistinguishable in the minds of those who encourage and those who participate in them. Each is an excuse and in turn a reward for the other.

In the meantime, from 1842 onward, with small thought of physical training, cricket had had a long and interesting history in the College. There had been intercollegiate match games, the formation of a Senior and a Junior Cricket Club, including at one time more than fifty players. There were whole dynasties of famous players, the Mitchells, the Thayers, the Clarks, the Hopkinson, the Pattersons, the Scotts; there was an English coach. Cricket brought the University into touch with Haverford College and with non-college groups, like Germantown and Merion,

including teams of English visitors. The sixties were probably the time of the greatest popularity of the game.¹ Much the same course of events marked the early history of rowing. The University Barge Club was formed in 1854 among the students who used to go out by bus to "Old Charlie's" boat house at Fairmount in the afternoons to hire boats for a row on the river. Later they bought a barge of their own and became resplendent in rowing costumes on which U.B.C. was conspicuous. Ultimately they built a boathouse situated on city property and took in outsiders. The College Boat Club was next formed and introduced competitive college rowing. Sparring and fencing may have been picked up by some students at Tom Barrett's gymnasium on Market Street above Eighth, or at Jim Hughes's billiard parlor on Sansom above Sixth, or at Baldy Sorer's tavern on the other side of Ninth Street, or other resorts referred to, presumably, in Provost Stillé's strictures on the disorderliness of the neighborhood of the University.

When the University moved to West Philadelphia, the open lots around the new buildings allowed of track and field sports, and football in a crude form appeared on the scene. Associations were formed for the various sports. In the fall of 1873 a number of students of the classes of '75, '76, and '77 formed themselves into the Athletic Association. Effingham B. Morris, then a junior, destined to be a lifelong devotee of athletics and a warm supporter of many more serious University interests, was the first President. All this was quite without administrative or even much alumni encouragement, and, as to the Faculty, mainly without approval. The Faculty had an instinctive hostility to athletics as the strongest or at least the most conspicuous competitor for the time and interest of the student with the studies which should be his principal—in the minds, no doubt, of some —his only interest.

It was on the athletic field that some of the most interesting and persistent of Pennsylvania's college customs originated. The red and blue that on special occasions now spreads like a sea widely over Philadelphia, and at all times gives a color to so

¹ A. H. Graham, Jr., *Cricket at the University of Pennsylvania*, privately printed, 1930.

much of official as well as unofficial ceremony in a thousand scattered places, was first seen, according to a well-established tradition, at a college track meet held in 1874 at Saratoga, New York. Here, according to this testimony, Henry Laussat Geyelin, of the class of '77, entering the hundred-yard dash, was asked what were his colors. On the spur of the moment, seeing red and blue each used by some others as single colors, he adopted a combination of the two.

It was probably the first official choice of the colors that remains in the memory of this writer, from a date seven years later. On February 22, 1881, as the undergraduates stood in front of College Hall waiting to accompany Dr. Pepper down town to the Academy of Music where he was to be inaugurated Provost, they were each handed a strip of red and blue ribbon to tie in a buttonhole or to be otherwise displayed. There are but few still living who received those favors that day, but the army of which they were the vanguard has been a mighty one, to which the red and blue has meant a deeper sentiment than in our Anglo-Saxon shyness we are willing to acknowledge.

The next step came from the Provost, who in April 1882 invited a group of graduates of the University interested in athletics to a meeting at the office of C. Stuart Patterson "to discuss the question of athletic sports." Later other meetings were held, including undergraduates. As a result of these discussions a new and much stronger University Athletic Association was formed and in the same year incorporated. It appointed standing committees to exercise oversight of the five principal branches of sport. Its first considerable performance, however, was the preparation for use of the first University playing field. This was on the tract now partly covered by the Dormitories. It extended from Thirty-sixth to Thirty-seventh Street, and from Spruce to Pine. This tract had been given to the University by the city in return for fifty free scholarships to be awarded to pupils of the city public schools. The ground was put in order and seating stands were built by the new Athletic Association, at an expense of some \$15,000, principally subscribed by interested alumni, under an agreement with the Trustees that the ground should not be diverted to other uses except after three months' notice to

the Association. It was opened at the spring athletic sports of 1885 and was the scene of much interesting athletic history for the next eight or ten years.

In the meantime a new movement for physical training came to the fore. May 14, 1883, the Board of Trustees by resolution established in the College a Department of Physical Culture, adding \$5 a year to tuition fees for its maintenance. Dr. J. William White of the Medical School Faculty was appointed its Director. Its actual foundation was delayed, but in January 1885 it was formally opened at a crowded meeting in the chapel of College Hall, where Provost Pepper and Dr. White spoke. By December the old assembly room in the basement had been transformed, with the personal advice and assistance of Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, and on the Harvard model, into a usable if not an adequate gymnasium. There can be no doubt that among the causes of the increase of University enrollment noticeable at this time the growing prominence of athletics and even the attention paid to physical training were highly effective. No better means of advertising the existence and claims to usefulness of colleges and universities has been found than competitive sports. It may be doubted whether there is any close connection between success in athletics and large enrollment, but there is no doubt they have brought the institutions that are active in that field, whether victorious or defeated, into public notice.

In the later days of Provost Pepper's administration two influences were pressing upon existing athletic conditions: one was the need of a new and larger gymnasium, the other the demand for the old athletic field as a site for dormitories. In 1892 the first steps were taken toward obtaining a new athletic field by applying to the city for the waste land to the east of that which the University was then so rapidly covering with its buildings. During that and the next year this wild region was filled in and graded by the efforts of the interested alumni. In 1894 it was handed over to the Athletic Association, and the name of Franklin Field, now so familiar, was adopted for it. On April 20, 1895, Franklin Field was formally opened in the presence of the Provost, a number of Trustees and city officials, and a great crowd that had gathered for the first intercollegiate and interscholastic

relay races that have since annually attracted much appreciative interest.

The \$500,000 to \$600,000 which has been expended on the new gymnasium, grandstands, training houses, and other dependencies of Franklin Field took ten years more to collect and spend, and it was not till December 1904 that Weightman Hall and the Gymnasium were formally opened and handed over to the Trustees in the presence of a great assembly. Dr. White could still take part in the opening exercises as he had of the Department of Physical Culture twenty years before. They represented, however, the entrance on his duties of a newly appointed Director, Dr. R. Tait McKenzie, whose devotion to his task, insight into its possibilities, artistic gifts, and personal attractiveness have made his recent passing a sad event in the history of physical culture at the University. The new Gymnasium, the new requirements, penetrating into every department of the University, the new Director and corps of assistants, the additional buildings, and the long series of picturesque struggles on Franklin Field in the years since have been a colorful history, of which only limitations of space and time justify the omission from this book.¹

SOME EXPERIMENTS

During the decade from 1880 to 1890 the University entered more than once, if only for a short distance, on unfamiliar paths. One of these was its patronage of the significant work and inventions of Eadweard Muybridge, whose fantastic spelling of his first name was only one of many peculiarities. At the corner of Thirty-sixth and Spruce streets, where the Maloney Clinic Building now stands, was erected a strange group of sheds and other buildings where the inventor had established himself with the encouragement and at the expense of Provost Pepper and a number of other gentlemen interested in the University and in these investigations. Here Mr. Muybridge had a series of cameras and other devices from which emerged striking studies in animal

¹ See among other sources the article on the Athletic Association in *Old Penn*, May 24, 1913, p. 1094, and on the Department of Physical Education in the same journal for June 7, 1913, pp. 1157-64.

locomotion. He was a skillful photographer and an inventive genius. His work was a part—a by no means unimportant part—of that series of inventions and trials and errors that eventually created the new world of moving and talking pictures as we now know them. Using instantaneous photography at the very beginning of its career, he photographed in motion student athletes from the campus, animals borrowed from the zoölogical garden, thoroughbred horses loaned by interested owners, men, women and children, and a great variety of subjects in an endless variety of movements, till he had built up that striking series of 781 plates, with more than 20,000 pictures, that represent his work while at the University.

He invented a device for reproducing the pictures, showing men, animals, and birds in motion, which he called the "zoöpraxoscope." At the Columbian Exposition of 1893 the Fine Arts Committee of the Exposition thought enough of his work to put up for him a special building. Here, with the support of the National Bureau of Education, he exhibited daily from May to October, to applauding audiences, the results of his experiments. For these the University was given the credit in a diploma from the authorities of the Fair, "For the extent and scientific importance of the collection of photographs made by Mr. Eadweard Muybridge under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania." Those interested in his series of investigations, including Dr. Leidy, Harrison Allen, Professor Barker, and others, had contributed some \$40,000 toward their cost during the three years Muybridge was at the University.

In 1887 he published eleven volumes containing some 100,000 photographs representing his work both in California, where he had formerly tested the gait of race horses, and in Pennsylvania, under the general head of *Animal Locomotion*, showing many pictures of men and women in unconventional garb or lack of it. The University published a short technical description of his work.¹ By no means least in interest in this episode is the statement made by the Provost in describing it, of his conception of the function of the University as including not only teaching and

¹ Article by George E. Nitzsche in *Old Penn*, April 19, 1913, pp. 933-38, "Animal Locomotion and Muybridge's Work at the University of Pennsylvania, 1888."

research by its advanced scholars, but the appointment and support of scientists in prolonged and expensive investigations. Universities, fully occupied with the first two of these functions, have seldom had means to subsidize scholars outside their own faculties; but along with the millions now annually granted for research by various foundation, more and more the universities, Pennsylvania among them, are being entrusted with funds for this purpose.

An even more remote search was contemplated by the gift in 1883 from Mr. Henry Seybert, a cousin of Provost Pepper, of \$60,000 as endowment of a chair in philosophy, accompanied by a request, tantamount to a condition, that the incumbent, with the help of an officially appointed committee, should make a study of the claim to truth of all systems of religion, especially the subject of modern spiritualism, which Mr. Seybert accepted. He added \$20,000 to the endowment to pay the expenses of the contemplated investigation of spiritualism. The University took the matter seriously, appointed a distinguished committee, of which the Provost acted as chairman and Professor Fullerton as secretary, a large library of books on all phases of the occult was collected and the committee entered upon a series of tests, séances, and other forms of investigation. In May 1887 the Seybert Commission made a preliminary report to the Board of Trustees, which was published, but intentionally given only a limited circulation. Several members of the commission appended their personal observations to the testimony published in the report. Not having reached any convincing results, indeed overwhelmed by a mass of deception, the investigation was suspended, although successive holders of the Seybert Chair of Philosophy have given evidence of the interest with which its foundation was connected.

Another form of external investigation, one with which Provost Pepper was much concerned during the whole period of his administration and until his death, was the series of expeditions and successive steps in organization that culminated in the establishment of the Free Museum of Science and Art of the University. Its affairs came to the front over and over again, but the erection of the building and the establishment of its direct re-

lation to the University fall so definitely into the period of his successor that the story may be better brought up to date there, so far as it is possible to tell it at all. It must not be forgotten, however, that the increased interest in the University by the surrounding community, so characteristic of the modern period, was strengthened in many ways by the Museum connection. Still other movements—the building of the Dormitories and the Gymnasium, provision of a permanent home for the Law Department, and others that reached their full growth at a later time—had their roots in this period, so full of fertile suggestions and beginnings.

THE ALUMNI

The interest of the alumni in the University during its long history has waxed and waned. We have seen the temporary activity of the newly organized Society of the Alumni of the College in the middle years of last century and the pressure of the Medical alumni for reform in their department in the seventies; athletics have always drawn the interest of many of the alumni, and in the period after 1880 this was expressed by their support of the Athletic Association and liberal gifts for the preparation of playing fields and for the building of the Gymnasium. Soon after the accession of Provost Pepper to office, at the request of the Society of the Alumni a closer connection with the University was made by the creation of the Central Committee of the Alumni. This body, made up of ten representatives of the graduates of each of the departments, was clothed by vote of the Board of Trustees in 1881 with various powers, the most considerable of which was a right to nominate a candidate, with the expectation that their nominee would be elected, for every third vacancy on the Board.

They first exercised this privilege four years later, when Mr. John C. Sims, a graduate of the class of 1865 and secretary of the Pennsylvania Railroad, was nominated by the Committee and elected. He was a man of varied interests, who had been active in athletic matters, and was in every way a suitable candidate. The practice thus well established was followed later by the

elections of Judge Henry Reed, Samuel F. Houston, Charles S. W. Packard, Dr. Wharton Sinkler, Henry Galbraith Ward, Louis C. Madeira, George Wharton Pepper, and Samuel G. Dixon. The election of Mr. Ward was the first instance of the choice of a Trustee from outside the Philadelphia area, the legality of which had been questioned up to this time.

Meanwhile the General Alumni Society had been organized, following a meeting in 1894 of alumni of all departments, on June 12, 1895, and shortly thereafter its officers began to inquire why the privilege of electing to every third vacancy should not be vested in them, instead of in the Central Committee of the Alumni. It was not until January 1914, however, that the Trustees admitted the justice of the claim and made the necessary change in their statutes. Acting on this new privilege the Directors of the General Alumni Society made nominations for a vacancy in February 1916, and Mr. William A. Redding, of New York, was elected. We must pass for the moment to a later period.

In January 1917 the General Alumni Society, with the approval of the University Trustees, changed its by-laws to provide for a new method of election of Alumni Trustees. Under this plan at each third vacancy, the Society, having been notified, submitted six names. The Trustees selected three of them, or had the privilege of suggesting changes in the list. The three names finally agreed upon were then submitted to a ballot by the general body of graduates, and the Trustees were bound to elect the candidate who had the highest vote, not less than four thousand ballots having been cast. The first election on this plan was that of Hampton L. Carson in May 1917.

This continued to be the plan of election of Alumni Trustees until the amendment of the statutes in 1928, when the present provision for ten such Trustees was adopted. The Trustees, however, did not always insist upon the provision that four thousand ballots should be cast.

In accordance with the power of the Central Committee of the Alumni to appoint committees to visit the University and to make recommendations, occasional visits to classes were made and criticisms registered, conferences were held with deans, professors, and students, but nothing very constructive emerged.

The fatal weakness of all alumni interposition, ignorance of the actual conditions that have to be met, made their suggestions, however well meant, ineffective, and the practice of visitation soon died out. The committee was more successful in another field of endeavor, the encouragement of formation of local and class organizations of alumni. The New York Society of the Alumni, the first of such outside bodies, was organized at a dinner at Delmonico's in November 1886, shortly after the performance by the students of their Greek play in New York. The Provost made the speech of the evening. Similar organizations were formed in Chicago in 1892 and in Pittsburgh in 1894, the forerunners of the scores of such societies later formed throughout the country and abroad and of the hundred and more that have now come to exist. The Central Committee also encouraged the formation of class alumni organizations and initiated in 1887 the custom of classes holding their meetings at the University on Commencement Day.

The General Alumni Society was incorporated in 1896 and in the next year could report more than a thousand dues-paying members. Ambitious projects—to build an alumni hall or auditorium, to endow an alumni professorship of Greek, and others—were for a time advocated and even entered upon but for one reason or another not followed out. The interest of the alumni nevertheless has, once aroused, been continuous, has expressed itself in various forms and, as has been said above, with varying degrees of assertiveness, as will appear somewhat later in this narrative.

THE LIBRARY

Before the period of Dr. Pepper's administration was over the Library at last had its building and its modern organization. It was one of the last departments of the University to yield to the expansive tendencies of the new age. Until the time we have now reached it was a small, though carefully selected body of books, established in locked cases in one of the central rooms of College Hall. It was under the administration of a committee of the Board of Trustees and of one of the professors, who acted

as librarian in addition to his teaching duties, and was present to unlock cases and give out and receive books only at certain appointed hours in the week. Part of this backwardness is quite explicable. Situated in a large city with many libraries it was by no means the only or even the principal source of supply for reading matter of students and professors. Drawn as they so largely were in early times from well-to-do Philadelphia families, students had also their home libraries, often very excellent libraries, to utilize. So much of the teaching of early times was based on textbooks and so many of the lectures were purely didactic that texts for the classical and modern language courses were all that the average student used, and for his lectures the only additional book he really needed was his notebook.

In 1884, for the first time, the University had a trained and paid Librarian, J. G. Barnwell, the donor later of the well-known Barnwell Foundation of the Philadelphia High School. After three years he resigned and Gregory B. Keen became Librarian; even yet the Library was not handed permanently over to the administration of a professional librarian, for Morris Jastrow, whose services as professor of Oriental languages did not make much claim upon his time, served for some years as Librarian. But by that time there was a trained library staff, leaving to the head of the Library administrative and literary rather than technical duties. The change in his position is indicated by the somewhat later provision in the by-laws that "the academic standing of the Librarian is that of professor."

December, 1888, the cornerstone of the University Library building was laid by the Provost in full Masonic regalia; by 1890 it was so nearly completed that most of the books were transferred, and it was opened to the use of the students in the fall. The erection of the building was hastened and it was completed at this time, before the great building era under the next Provost had begun, largely because it was to be used, for the time at least, as a place of deposit and display of objects which would find their final place in the Museum. Products of the excavations in Babylonia and gifts of archaeological material from elsewhere were accumulating in the University's possession before there was any place to put them except as the Library from

1890 for eight years became a Museum as well as a Library.

February 1891 the building was dedicated to its principal use as a repository of books and a workroom of students in an impressive ceremony. It has been the heart of the University since. It was at the time of its erection considered very fine; it was indeed the triumphant product of a popular architect and an admired example of his school. According to later standards it is in doubtful taste and of questionable adaptation to its uses. It has had many interesting additions of books besides those that are purchased as they appear. An early addition was the Colwell Library, a collection of books and pamphlets on economics. In 1923 the Henry C. Lea Library of Medieval History was housed, by the gift of the son of the historian, in an addition to the Library consisting of a reconstruction on the University grounds of Mr. Lea's library in its original condition. The Shakespeare library of Horace Howard Furness was placed in the University Library in 1932. Notwithstanding the growth of its collections, its usefulness to several of the short generations of college students, and the notable events of which it has been the scene, it has long been the dearest wish of many that it should be superseded by a new building. It is not likely that the University will have advanced far into its third century without the erection of a far larger, more beautiful, and more convenient library building than that which has served its purposes since 1891.

CHANGES IN THE FIELD OF MEDICINE

Provost Pepper's interest in the Medical School was naturally deep and in his early years predominant. He had already been connected with that department twelve years when he became Provost; the total period of his service in it was thirty years. Long before he became Provost he had in a formal address indicated what should be the direction of development of that department as he conceived of it. It was an old custom at the opening of the medical courses in the fall for one of the professors, indeed sometimes for each of them, to address the students on subjects of a general character; some of these addresses, among them this of Dr. Pepper's, have become famous. October 1, 1877, fresh from

his work as Medical Director of the Centennial Exposition with its national and international connections, he delivered an address on "Higher Medical Education the True Interest of the Public and the Profession," in which, in a critical spirit, he stated the shortcomings of preparation for medical practice in the United States at the time, and pointed out the lines of desirable and possible progress. Applying these principles to the University through his whole career as professor and Provost, he exercised constant pressure toward the attainment of reform in that field.

Yet the decade from 1870 to 1880 had seen so much accomplished that his period as Provost saw no comparable changes. There was little that was notable except the lengthening of the course, the establishment of the Department of Hygiene, and, just at the end of his time, the foundation of the Pepper Clinical Laboratory. The adoption of a compulsory three-year course, with the corresponding systematic arrangement of the curriculum, was accomplished in 1877, the year of his address; the adoption of the four-year course was fifteen years later, in 1892. The introduction of the requirement of four years of medical study was closely connected with the establishment of the Department of Hygiene. In 1889 Mr. Henry C. Lea, the historian, a wealthy and liberal citizen of Philadelphia, impressed with the need for preventive medicine, offered to build for the University a laboratory of hygiene. He made, however, certain conditions, perhaps suggested by the Provost, and certainly not unwelcome to him. These were that an additional sum of \$250,000 be collected for the equipment and endowment of the Department; that Dr. John S. Billings, whose reputation as a hospital administrator was becoming widespread, be appointed its Director as well as teacher of the subject; that hygiene be made a compulsory study in the Medical School, and that steps be immediately taken to extend the medical course to four years. Mr. Lea also placed a time limit on the fulfilment of these conditions.

The steps by which the Provost succeeded in meeting these requirements are a good example of how a new stream of financial support was being directed, albeit with infinite labor and difficulty, into the University's service. He succeeded in obtaining

the agreement of Dr. Billings, who had just declined Johns Hopkins' offer to be superintendent of its hospital, by making a hasty trip to Baltimore, offering him a liberal salary, and inducing him to agree to the arrangement in a written contract. Dr. Pepper himself contributed \$10,000. He succeeded in obtaining private subscriptions of sums ranging from \$5,000 to \$25,000 from several wealthy men, together with many smaller subscriptions, and was able within the time limit to assign to the endowment of a chair of hygiene a sum of \$60,000 just bequeathed by his brother George S. Pepper for a professorship in the Medical School, thus completing the needed sum.

Dr. Pepper was always himself a liberal contributor to the University. He returned to it his salary as professor in the Medical School and that paid him as Provost. The patients who contributed to his large income from his medical, especially his consultative practice, were, perhaps unknowingly, possibly sometimes unwillingly contributing to the upbuilding of the University, for there were few University objects to which he did not himself subscribe in money as well as in time and in enthusiastic interest. His success in obtaining the interest and support of others was of equal or greater significance.

The Laboratory of Hygiene was opened February 22, 1892. It became the center of a department of study of that subject of which Dr. Billings during his stay in Philadelphia, from 1892 to 1896, laid the foundation, in addition to his work as Director of the University Hospital. It was the first institution of its kind in the United States. It became, like several other departments, one of the links which united the University with the surrounding community by its courses, opened in 1909, leading to the degree of Doctor of Public Health and its close connection with the Department of Public Health of the city. But this and other extensions in this field belong to a later period. This was only the time of beginnings.

A plan close to the heart of Dr. Pepper, as physician rather than as Provost, was brought to completion only after he had ceased to hold office. It was, however, a characteristic product of his period. He had, according to the testimony of Dr. Stengel, his assistant at that time, had it in mind since 1893. This was the

establishment of the William Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine. He furnished it with its first endowment, in honor of his father, William Pepper, Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine and of Clinical Medicine from 1860 to 1864.

It was to be a subsidiary of the University Hospital, yet independent in management and support and in its services. The University Hospital was in a position different from that of most hospitals of the time in being closely attached to a Medical School. To include in the advanced studies of the school the pathological conditions that appeared in the hospital was a natural procedure. But this required special space and equipment and, at least in part, a new personnel—men devoted to research and trained for it.

Opportunity for scientific research in clinical problems had been the lifelong desire of a number of the younger group of physicians of the middle of the century. Original research into the cause and nature of disease was the next step of medical advance. They were the forerunners of what has become the most marked characteristic of modern medical study. The University Hospital, like other hospitals, had its small laboratories in which routine and necessary examinations of the excretions of patients were made by the internes; but something more advanced and specialized was needed. The study of tuberculosis appealed especially to Dr. Pepper, whose father and brother and many of whose closest friends were early carried away by that scourge of young manhood and womanhood. Heart disease and chronic diseases in general were scarcely less a challenge. As a beginning for such an institution in 1894 Dr. Pepper subscribed \$50,000 for the construction of a building, and for the partial endowment of research in it. In December 1895 this was dedicated, with explanatory addresses. Explanation was needed, for it was the first institution of its kind in the United States. It was to furnish room and equipment for a few men seriously engaged in medical investigation, and to a certain number of postgraduate students. No undergraduate instruction was to be allowed in it. It was the first step in the formation of what has since become the great group of medical and surgical research institutions in the University.

The Laboratory of Clinical Medicine was placed and long remained under the charge of Dr. Alfred Stengel, who gave up such assistance to Dr. Pepper and such private training in research of fourth-year medical students as he had been previously engaged in. He gathered around him a small group of men of scientific interest in medical research, some of whom, as in so many other fields of advanced intellectual interest at the time, had studied in Germany, Vienna, or Prague. From time to time the results of their studies, frequently previously published in medical journals, were gathered and issued in substantial volumes.

Notwithstanding the inadequacy of the endowment and the extent to which the routine pathological examinations they undertook to do for the Hospital intruded upon the time, space, and equipment of the Laboratory, it continued to do original work and to hold a distinguished position. In 1929 its old building was removed to give space for the erection of the Martin Maloney Memorial Clinic Building in which, along with other later established laboratories, the Pepper Clinical Laboratory, the oldest of them, still continues its work in the higher type of diagnostic investigation for the whole Hospital and in its own research along special medical lines.

THE CLOSE OF A GREAT ADMINISTRATION

Few men have possessed the physical and mental vigor of Dr. Pepper; still fewer have devoted that vigor so largely to public objects; and no one of the Provosts of the University has for so long a time, during so plastic a period, put his great powers at its service. It is difficult for the historian, as it was difficult for his contemporaries, to avoid attributing to Dr. Pepper's thought and action much of what occurred during his provostship which was by no means the product of his sole thought and effort. During several years of his administration he relied largely in College matters on Dr. Horace Jayne who, as Dean of the united College Faculty from 1889 to 1894, had much administrative influence. Dr. Pepper left him to attend to details that even his almost incredible industry could not supervise. During the last seven years of his administration Charles C. Harrison of the

Board of Trustees, who was in 1894 to succeed him as Provost, as Chairman of the all-important Committee of Ways and Means exercised a judgment and possessed a power that meant success or failure to movements that involved expenditure. For still other changes the Provost was only an intermediary, seizing upon some plan brought to him, encouraging the proposer, helping in its accomplishment, often contributing to its expense. Some changes of the time, as at all times, were part of the internal, evolutionary growth of the University over which the Provost had no control.

Yet after all is said it was a wonderful administration. For thirteen years Dr. Pepper had lived and worked mainly in the University, subordinating all his other interests to its demands. He had an almost Napoleonic power of doing two or more things at once. A professor, sometimes quite an obscure person, as this writer can testify, might be summoned to the Provost's home early in the morning to discuss some University problem between the Provost-Doctor's interviews with patients (the patient was fortunate if the two appointments were not at the same hour) while in the midst of the interview a knock at the door was followed by the entrance of a servant with the Doctor's breakfast, which he consumed while he continued the conversation. Day and night, for many hours, for many years, at high pressure, Dr. Pepper wrote or dictated letters—there is in existence a vast mass of writing in his own hand—prepared and delivered addresses, lectured to his classes, interviewed prospective donors or visited political personages in his efforts, surprisingly often successful, to induce city authorities to donate land to the University or state legislatures to make appropriations.

It is not a matter of surprise therefore that when in 1894 he insisted to the Board of Trustees that his health was being impaired by overwork and that there were other interests that still claimed his attention, his statement was believed and his resignation was accepted without protest. The Trustees voted to give him the degree of LL.D. at the approaching Commencement and appointed Dr. Horace Howard Furness to make a suitable address. The Commencement was a brilliant occasion; the Governor of the state presided in accordance with the requirements

of the law, usually more honored in the breach than in the observance, and Dr. Furness gave one of his rare and inimitable addresses. Interwoven with Shakespearean phrase he described the University of 1881 with its four buildings, the library of twenty thousand volumes (though this was too small an estimate), its fifty-five professors and slightly fewer than a thousand students, "but all of them hungry after knowledge and the professors had hard work to keep their gaping little mouths well filled." Then, according to Dr. Furness,

. . . there came a revival of interest in education, sweeping like a wind over Europe and reaching these spheres. In one of the eddies . . . our dear old University was caught and, lifting her serene eyes, she too pleaded for a wider range of usefulness and a larger recognition . . . and so we had to find a new Provost.

Do you think that an easy task? . . . Our ideal Provost had to be a man of marked individuality . . . a man of administrative ability, a man of firm will, able to read the future to the instant, of constant tact, and above all he must be vigilant to discern in the educational heavens the signs of the times . . . he need not of necessity be an anatomist but must nevertheless know to the extremest nicety the exact location in every man's body of the pocket-book nerve. . . . Do you think such Provosts are as plenty as blackberries?

He pointed to the twenty buildings that were the material products of Provost Pepper's policy, most of them now, alas, already inadequate, outmoded, superseded or about to be; to the three hundred professors and instructors and doubled number of students, as compared with those at the beginning of Dr. Pepper's administration, the five million dollars estimated value of the University property as compared with the million and a half of the earlier period. These were at least an outward indication of growth during a great period. Yet, he testified,

. . . at this hour the University is poor, wickedly poor, and she would still be poverty-stricken, let us fervently hope, if she had fifty millions instead of five. When any institution needs no more money, its hour of usefulness has struck, its life has departed and it had better close its gates. . . . Never therefore, as you love the dear old University, think that its cries for help will ever, ever cease. In that

hour when it says it has enough, oh then be sure to say the University is dead.

Note that this was not the speech of an aggressive leader in enterprise, an ambitious administrator eager to gain glory by exhibiting the spectacle of an institution growing great under his hand, but of a conservative Philadelphian, a plain man of letters, yet wise with wisdom drawn from the thoughts of the great dramatist, practical from long association as a Trustee with the needs, the problems, the aspirations of an institution which was only less than his alma mater.

But Dr. Furness was not apt to stop at material or external measurements of advance, so he enumerates some of the evidences of internal growth and intellectual adventuring.

These are some of the outward and visible expressions of the University of Pennsylvania as it stands today. But are they the University? "Stone walls do not a prison make," nor do they make a university. We may cover acres with buildings filled with every appliance for tuition, and yet they may all be dead and as unproductive of the life that now is as are the monastic cells in the desert of the Thebaid. The University is not neglectful of this higher life. In answer to our knockings the centuries buried beneath the sandy plains of Nippur have awakened to tell across the ages the old, old story of human life.

The University ought also here and now to "be a center whence, not merely by the annual graduation of classes, but through the active enthusiasm of its Faculty the intellectual life should be diffused far and wide."

Through all this wit and wisdom runs the recognition that the University must be provided with the necessary resources. He was too good and experienced a Trustee to fall into mere idealism. The University "must lie 'all Danaë to the stars,' receptive to all good influences," and among these influences must be money; "Expansion means life, and life means growth, and growth means money. . . . Every appeal for money which the University makes is the birth-cry of a new department which will widen its resources, extend its educational power, and enable it to answer the needs of the day." To fulfill "the needs of the day"—so this grand old gentleman, living almost as a recluse

from the present day, immersed in the past, connected with the audible world only by his old-fashioned ear-trumpet, went back to the teachings of Franklin and described the duty and the opportunity of the University.

If it be thought that these extracts are too much concerned with the University, too little with the person that called the address forth, the closing words of Dr. Furness, accompanying the gift of a bronze statue of Dr. Pepper from his friends, may be quoted to restore the balance:

The time will come when generations now unborn will gaze with gratitude upon it, and then, when all discords are hushed and all petty limitations of mortality are forgotten, and we are all gone "where are no storms, no noise, but silence and eternal sleep," then shall this image which I now unveil be held the true effigy of one whose heart and soul and mind and strength were devoted, while Provost, to the University of Pennsylvania.

The next best thing to having a distinguished career would be to have Horace Howard Furness sum it up.

As a matter of fact the career of Dr. Pepper was not closed in 1894, nor indeed did his interest in the University cease; but more and more his time and thought and gifts were devoted to the other public movements in which he was interested, especially the Free Library, the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, and the Free Museum of Science and Art. He passed away four years later, July 28, 1898, at the residence of Mrs. Phoebe Hearst in California, where he had been taken for recuperation after a breakdown in health. His remains were brought back to Philadelphia where he was buried at Laurel Hill.

The Administration of Charles C. Harrison

1894-1910

THE PROVOST AS BUILDER

If a University prophet could have stood in 1871 on the east bank of the Schuylkill and looked across the river to the open

fields of Blockley Farm and have seen in his mind's eye the wraith of the academic city which would arise there within the next three-quarters of a century, he would no doubt have arranged its buildings on some definite plan and designed them according to a consistent type of architecture. But, alas, there was no such official; the lands were acquired acre by acre, so to speak, and the buildings were erected as the need for them became imperative and as money to build them was found. The erection of some of them has been already described, but most of them were the handiwork, in a certain sense, of the twelfth Provost, Charles C. Harrison.

Spending money on "bricks and mortar," as contrasted with its expenditure for teaching and research, is frequently spoken of with disapproval. A familiar epigram about Mark Hopkins, a student, and a log has been responsible for much complacent inaction, in the belief, apparently, that by not erecting buildings good teaching is guaranteed. But neither teaching, study, nor research in these modern times can be carried on without buildings, library, laboratories, and equipment. The teacher is not enough; he needs implements. In all modern educational progress the material and the intellectual have advanced hand in hand. Those masterly achievements by great scholars in the early stages of acquiring knowledge in any field, provided only with the most exiguous and primitive of means, have deserved and have received generous recognition; but they have also awakened speculation as to what these scholars might have accomplished if they could have been aided by modern devices. Certainly those buildings with their equipment which at Pennsylvania, as in other modern universities, have been provided in the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries for higher education and research have been not only an accompaniment but a condition of all advanced study.

Mr. Harrison was the greatest builder in the history of the University. It can hardly be said of him as was said of a certain Roman emperor that he "found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble"; but it is a fact that just as thirteen new departments had been established in the same number of years of Provost Pepper's administration, so thirteen buildings to house

or re-house them and some new departments were provided in the sixteen years of Provost Harrison's; and although brick was more conspicuous in their construction than marble, yet it was particularly good brick with excellent limestone trimmings.

Some of this had been begun in the last administration, though even then largely with Mr. Harrison's aid; but the Museum, the Chemistry Building, the Law Building, the New Dental Building, the Wistar Institute, the Observatory, the Zoölogical Building, the new Laboratories of Anatomy and Physiology, with various minor buildings and extensions, to mention only those intended for academic uses, were products of his period, largely of his efforts. It was not, however, only the love of learning but an interest in the extra-academic life of the students that lay at the foundation of much of this building era. Houston Hall, the Dormitories and the Gymnasium, were built in the interest of carrying on a more wholesome and enjoyable college life among the students. The campus was by the close of Mr. Harrison's administration well-nigh covered with structures solid and, with some exceptions, of good design, adequate to their purposes at the time and most of them still so, though others are obviously, some of them clamorously, insufficient for modern needs.

Before proceeding, however, to an account of such events of Mr. Harrison's administration as it may prove possible to detail in this narrative it is necessary first to state the circumstances of his election, and secondly to say something of his personality. An expression used in Dr. Furness' address at Commencement, 1894, on announcing Dr. Pepper's resignation suggests that his successor had been already chosen, though he had only tentatively accepted. Speaking of Dr. Pepper's resignation he says, "Our dismay therein would be profound did we not believe that under the wise rule of him whose modesty will permit us to call him only a half-successor, the glowing and exuberant health of our fair and ever young mother would continue."

Mr. Harrison, whose influence over the course of events in his capacity of chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the Trustees since 1879 had been so great, and whose increasing devotion to the affairs of the University since he had retired

from business was so evident, was the logical candidate for Provost. The direction the development of the University had taken, the constantly increasing expenditures and the necessity for securing corresponding funds had made his position scarcely second in importance to that of the Provost himself. His success in obtaining money, his own liberal contributions, and his trained judgment in approving or deciding against new projects had obtained for him the trust of other members of the Board and was ultimately to win the confidence of the Faculty.

His long absorption in practical affairs, however, and his consequent detachment from academic problems made him diffident of his ability to meet the many-sided requirements of the provostship as they had been formulated at the accession to office of Dr. Pepper and added to during the thirteen years of his administration. Seth Low, recently elected as a business man President of Columbia, was facing the same problem with the same misgivings. Mr. Harrison therefore agreed to an appointment only as Acting Provost. He need not have been so apprehensive. He had been a Trustee for eighteen years. He was a man of culture. He had been graduated at the head of his class, had won various literary prizes while in college and had planned to study law before, at his father's request, he had entered the business in which he subsequently spent thirty years and from which he obtained a great fortune. His simple, lucid, and pregnant writing and speech compared not unfavorably with the warm and spirited style of his predecessor. It is a curious coincidence that two successive Provosts—Dr. Pepper and Mr. Harrison—John Cadwalader, a Trustee, Jesse Y. Burk, the Secretary of the University for many years, and two professors, Frazer and McElroy, were all members of the same College class, that of 1862. Why that particular class which, according to the reminiscences of still another member, George D. Budd, does not seem to have been particularly distinguished while in college, should have been called upon by the University for so disproportionate a contribution of administrative and professorial ability does not appear.

There was another requirement in Mr. Harrison's acceptance, that he should have the advice and assistance as Vice-Provost of

George S. Fullerton, C. '79. This brilliant young man has already been referred to as one of the creators of the Graduate School and as Secretary of the Seybert Commission. He was Professor of Philosophy at twenty-eight years of age, and was now, at Mr. Harrison's request, made Dean of the College and Vice-Provost. Additional powers and duties were at the same time attached to both of these offices. In 1896 he ceased to be Dean but remained Vice-Provost until 1898, and Professor of Philosophy until 1904. Professor Fullerton possessed that familiarity with more purely intellectual interests that Mr. Harrison felt he lacked. He was, besides, of an especially attractive personality. For some years he was the power behind the throne in all educational matters and indeed in many matters of general University policy. He won much influence and admiration and at the same time awakened much antagonism, and seems finally, as has been intimated above, to have ceased to have the confidence of the Provost. However, Mr. Harrison's success as Acting Provost was so obvious from the beginning that after a year he accepted the full provostship, which he retained for sixteen years.

His was undoubtedly a business administration, as everyone who had to do any estimating or accounting under him had reason to know. The center of gravity of the University was transferred to a rather obscure group of rooms in the midst of other business and financial offices in the depths of the city. Mr. Harrison was, like Dr. Pepper, a hard worker, early in his office in the city or at the University or engaged in some enterprise of University interest. There is abundant proof of the truth of his assertion at the end of his administration, that he had taken no rest from University affairs from the day he became Acting Provost, May 15, 1894, until New Year's Eve, 1910, when his resignation took effect. Yet he enjoyed his work. He acknowledged, at a dinner given him by the Trustees when he had been in office for some years, that when he was elected,

I said to Mrs. Harrison that as Provost I would never smile again; but from the happiness of my own home and from your trust in me and from the measureless kindness and generosity of the community to the University I believe that I have smiled oftener in the last eleven years than in all my life before.

It is possible, as Theodore Roosevelt declared, to have a "bully time" even in a burdensome office.

There was no complete break with the preceding administration, nor indeed could there be, considering Mr. Harrison's large participation in it. The establishment of new departments which had so markedly characterized the preceding administration still continued, though at a decreasing rate that suggested an approach to the saturation point in the variety of the University's functions. The provision of adequate housing for both old and new departments and for previously unrecognized activities for which this administration was famous in itself involved much choice of what plans to encourage, what to disregard.

THE HARRISON FOUNDATION

Mr. Harrison began his career as Provost, as Dr. Pepper had closed his, with an act of filial remembrance. Just as the late Provost had founded in memory of his father the Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine, so Mr. Harrison signalized the opening of his administration by the munificent gift of half a million dollars for endowment in the Graduate School, in memory of his father, of the George L. Harrison Foundation for the Encouragement of Liberal Studies and the Advancement of Knowledge. The date of the gift was January 4, 1895. It was largely due to the suggestion of Professor Fullerton. Its objects, as stated by its donor and already referred to, were few, but far reaching: to establish fellowships and scholarships for young men of unusual ability, to add to the Library books required in their work by the fellows, and other works of scientific value, to relieve temporarily from their teaching professors of ability and inclination to carry out some special object of research, and lastly to secure men of distinction to reside for a term at the University.

Only the first and to some extent the second of these objects have been so far carried out. Within these limits, however, this fund has been of the utmost value. It was the first substantial foundation in the Graduate School, whose work had been carried on for ten years in comparative obscurity, except as a few indi-

vidual professors attracted students, and its classes were filled with M.A. students. The Harrison Foundation gave an invaluable nucleus of research students seeking further training. A long list of carefully chosen young men, graduates of various colleges, already partially matured by at least one year of graduate work and interested predominantly in some field of knowledge, relieved for the time from worry about support, have enjoyed the lectures, seminar work, and supervision of their theses by professors interested in the same field of study, companionship of men and women similarly occupied in advanced work, life in a large city, and a certain amount of leisure for reading and the attainment of intellectual maturity.

Students on such fellowships for graduate work, both men and women, and other students supported by teaching for part of their time or studying at their own expense have attended the Graduate School primarily for training in research, and have enabled it to graduate men who now occupy leading positions in their various specialties in many colleges and universities, while others carry on investigations in institutions devoted especially to research. Mr. Harrison retained a special interest in the Graduate School and impressed on the Foundation a policy that has ultimately raised its capital to more than a million dollars, though a large part of this has been diverted to the service of another department. He seldom lost an opportunity to appeal for a building and further endowment for the school. It has, however, remained without especial habitation except so far, as will be noted later, as it shares in the use of Bennett Hall for its administrative offices, private offices for some of its teachers, and a certain amount of teaching space. The lack of a special building for the Graduate School, though no doubt a limitation on its usefulness, has been less of a loss than perhaps Mr. Harrison and his administrative successors have felt. It is especially a department of men and books and laboratory equipment. Given a teacher of scholarship and creative ability, students of good preliminary training, of industry and ambition, and books and the other necessary tools of their trade, much can be and has been accomplished with a minimum of material provision and organization. The professors in the Graduate School have

been, almost without exception, occupied also in teaching in the College or the Wharton School, in biology, astronomy, or the Scientific School, wresting as much time as practicable from teaching in those departments in order to do their work in this higher field or in their own research and writing or engaged in service in their various scholarly connections. Yet the work of the Graduate School has gone on, probably none the less effectively in most fields from the fact that members of its Faculty have been compelled at the same time to deal with less mature students and to recur constantly to the fundamentals of their subjects.

Nor was the Graduate School itself entirely a school of research. The transfer of the degree of M.A. from the College to the Graduate School in 1892, the prosperity it brought to this department, and at the same time the problems of teaching and research it created, have already been mentioned. It was these problems of the double objective of the school that led to the appointment of a committee on degrees and ultimately to the appointment of the Committee on Research that must be discussed later.

Somewhat the same memorial character as the Harrison Foundation was borne by the Harrison Laboratory of Chemistry, a gift made even before Mr. Harrison became Provost, by him and his two brothers as a memorial to their grandfather, John Harrison, one of the earliest of the long line of Philadelphia chemists. Completed in 1893, it is now antiquated in its equipment and sadly insufficient for the needs of that popular and growing subject. But it has been for almost half a century the scene of much good teaching and investigation. The prominence traditionally given to chemistry at the University, even in undergraduate instruction, has kept the building filled, indeed overfilled, with beginners and has relegated to other surroundings those engaged in more advanced work. It was here, however, that Dr. Smith in his early and creative years did his original work in electro-analysis, and here in a congenial atmosphere he wrote the history of his favorite subject and the biographies of its creators, and made the collections that still remain there, the richest existing collection of records in that field.

HOUSTON HALL AND THE DORMITORIES

In the long list of University buildings that were erected year by year under Mr. Harrison, each the embodiment of some long-planned development, each making possible some branch of University work, there were two that came especially close to his heart, Houston Hall and the Dormitories. Not only were they almost the first fruits of his administration, but they appealed to his often-expressed sense of responsibility for the life of the students outside the classroom.

The first step in the movement that led to the existence of Houston Hall was a memorial dated February 7, 1893, presented to the Board of Trustees through Mr. Merrick by a group of students, alumni, and members of the Faculty, asking the Trustees' attention to the need of the University for a students' hall. The Board gave it favorable consideration, appointed a commission of which Mr. Harrison was chairman, and recommended that \$100,000 should be collected for a building, and \$150,000 for its endowment. Religion bulked large in the plan, but provision for reading and conversation, for a gymnasium and games, rooms for college societies and other such social interests of the students was contemplated. The commission, to which members of the Faculty were later added, formulated an appeal for funds. They pointed out that there were two thousand students in the University, that it was now the third largest in the country, and that one thousand of the students lived near the University without family or other supervision or social opportunities. Many of them were of limited means. The great growth of the University had been "marked by a singular deficiency in its instrumentalities for promoting religious and moral life, as well as for social intercourse." Other institutions had buildings or halls intended as centers of such beneficial influences. "Pennsylvania alone has made no effort to provide for the wants of her students in this direction."

In order to strengthen this appeal, in April 1894 Mr. Harrison announced that prizes would be given for the best design for such a students' hall or club house. Later it was decided to give

only one prize, of \$1,000, and to restrict contestants to juniors, seniors, and graduates of the School of Architecture. The competition was put under the charge of Professor Laird, who had just been made head of that school. Since the problem in this form was quite a new one, the specifications were drawn up with great care, and Professor Laird arranged that the decision should be made by a jury of well-known Philadelphia and New York architects. The plans were handed in in May, and a design offered by two students—a junior and a senior, Hays and Medary—working together, was approved. Frank M. Day, of the class of '83, in whose office one of the men was working, was appointed architect, and the two contestants assistant architects of the proposed building.

The design was of importance because the building was one of the earliest of the new group at the University and because it became to some extent the model for similar students' club houses elsewhere. It was fairly anticipated that it would do much toward providing for a wholesome and enjoyable life for the students, and at the same time increase the growth of college spirit, that tenuous sentiment in which Pennsylvania had always been, perhaps still is somewhat deficient. The drawings so pleased Mr. Harrison, who in the meantime had become Acting Provost, that he hastened to Chestnut Hill, according to tradition, on a snowy night, to the residence of Mr. H. H. Houston, a wealthy and liberal member of the Board of Trustees, interested like himself in the religious and social life of the students, to submit to him the plans for the club house and to plead the needs of the students. Before he left he had received from Mr. Houston and his wife what the Provost afterwards called their "princely contribution." They had promised each to give \$50,000 for the purpose.

November 6, 1894, he was able to report to the Board that this contribution with some later additions made possible the immediate erection of the building. The cornerstone was laid December 1894 and the building was opened to the students January 7, 1896. Mr. Houston had died during the intervening year, but he took great satisfaction before his death in knowing that the building was approaching completion. The Trustees decided

to name the building Houston Hall as a memorial to Mr. Houston's son Howard, of the class of 1878, who had died shortly after his graduation.

The "Houston Club," consisting of all students in the University, formed to utilize and govern the club house, furnished immediately a constituency of whom more than a thousand a day made use of its facilities. The worn limestone steps began soon to give proof of the common statement that it was the most popular club in Philadelphia. By actual count some years later, on one day 6,260 persons entered the club between 8 A. M. and 10 P. M. To those familiar with the uses of the Houston Club it is a mystery where the thousands of students who daily pass through its doorways and utilize its restaurants, its reading and writing rooms, its post office, its billiard tables, its bookstore, its offices for college activities, spent their time before 1896. When the College chapel was turned to other uses and the Irvine Auditorium as yet was not, where could the intimate talks and lectures that brought throngs together, and all the various religious, scientific, patriotic, and political groups have gathered if there had been no Houston Hall? If it were not that so many other changes were taking place at the same time one would be tempted to divide the history of the University into two periods, that before and that after the erection of Houston Hall. Considering the part it has played in University life it is gratifying that the family of its original donors have continued their generous interest and have recently nearly doubled its space, extending its functions to new fields of usefulness and enjoyment.

In the same year and largely with the same ideal as Houston Hall, the first section of the Dormitories was built and opened. Whether to build dormitories or not was an old question. Like so many others it goes back to the earliest days. The decision at that time to establish the institution in the city rather than in the country was fateful in many ways. A recently discovered letter of Franklin, written in February 1750, says; "It was long doubtful whether the Academy would be fixed in the town or country; but a majority of those from whose generous subscriptions we expected to be able to carry the scheme into execution being

strongly for the town, it was at last fixed to be there."¹ The city location of the College seemed to make dormitories a luxury rather than a necessity. Most students lived at home or with relatives, and there is always room for students in city boarding houses.

It will be remembered that in 1765 a building was erected for combined use for a dormitory and the Free School, but the plan did not work out well. When the College and Medical School moved to Ninth Street no attempt was made to provide living quarters for the few college students then in attendance, or for the raft of medical students, so many of whom came and went with such irregularity. The questionable reputation the Ninth Street location came to have may not have been unconnected with the students' boarding houses of the region. There was some talk of endowment for a dormitory in 1877, soon after the move to West Philadelphia, but nothing came of it.²

An ill-informed or perhaps only ill-natured critic whose anonymity was covered by the initials B. J., writing from Philadelphia in a New York journal in 1885, stated that some years before the Trustees of the University had been offered a large legacy if they would build dormitories, but declined it on the ground that it was the settled policy of the institution to train boys in such a way that they would "regard Philadelphia doctrines, ideas, atmosphere and surroundings as final" while to expose them to meeting those from other places in common dormitories would involve a change of this policy.³

If this interpretation of University opinion was other than purely fantastic it passed through a remarkably sudden change, for in 1892 the Trustees announced that a site for dormitories had been chosen and a plan for their construction was being drawn up. The problem had been put in the hands of the De-

¹ This letter has had a curious history. It was written to Cadwallader Colden of New York, given by him to Bancroft, the historian, and by Bancroft to Elisha Kent Kane, the Arctic explorer. It was read by him to the American Philosophical Society in 1843 and printed in the *Proceedings*, III, 168. The original is in the Society's collection.

² See letter of John Welsh to Provost Pepper written from France, Nov. 28, 1877; printed in Thorpe, *William Pepper, M.D.*, p. 77.

³ *The Nation*, New York, Dec. 10, 1885.

partment of Architecture, and the general design then adopted has been followed in the main in their extension since. Provost Pepper had repeatedly urged their importance, and in the message that accompanied his resignation in 1894 he was able to say that enough money was on hand to allow building to be started. The best location for an extensive dormitory group was evidently the old athletic field and, as will be remembered, it was necessary to reclaim that site from the Athletic Association and to give it what proved ultimately to be the still finer site that became Franklin Field.

One of the first activities of Provost Harrison was to give the order for beginning their construction, and in 1896 he reported that one-third of the contemplated plan was completed. Up to that time the building had cost over \$200,000, all contributed by individual givers, while approximately \$5,000 more was contributed for partially furnishing the rooms to make their occupancy easier for students of limited means. By the beginning of the second year all the rooms in the first section except a few of the most expensive were occupied; demand followed supply as new sections were built, and it was evident that this addition to the amenities of student life at Pennsylvania had become a permanency. There had been some fear that the students would take advantage of their detachment from all oversight to make the dormitories a place where wine, women, and song might play an equally large part with study and sleep; but there was almost no such trouble, and if an occasional "Oh, Rowbottom" broke out, the disorder did not go very deep or spread very widely.

The line of "houses" as the successive additions were called, crept down Spruce Street, Woodland Avenue, and Hamilton Walk, enclosed the "Little Quad" and the "Triangle," surrounded and then subdivided the "Big Quad." The "Class of 1887," "New York Alumni," "McKean," "Provost Smith," "Bishop White," "Mask and Wig," and other houses were built and occupied as subscriptions were made. On February 13, 1900, the corner stone of the Memorial Tower and Gateway in honor of Pennsylvania men who had served in the Spanish-American War, the most recent military experience, was laid by General Miles, then at the head of the army. By this time some \$600,000

had been spent on the dormitories, and they provided for 525 of the 1,000 students planned for in the original design. The dormitories alone, of all University buildings, were a source of income to the University, and as the cost of construction had all been contributed, the approximate three per cent on the investment which resulted from their careful administration at rates of rent no greater than those charged in West Philadelphia rooming houses of proportional comfort was, like the quality of mercy, twice blest, to the advantage of the needy student and the still more needy University.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Impressive as were the new buildings that were covering the campus, there was another change in progress which if less conspicuous was even more characteristic of the time. This was the increase in the service the University was performing for the surrounding community. The University was no longer willing to sit in her shop and dispose of her intellectual wares to those who came to seek them, but went out into the open market place and offered such goods as seemed to be in demand. Indeed, to carry the mercantile figure of speech somewhat further, she interested herself in the needs, not merely in the expressed demands of the people.

There were in a large city like Philadelphia and its suburbs many hundreds of school teachers who felt the inadequacy of their preparation or nursed intellectual ambitions that the pressure of school hours and school work left no opportunity to remedy or to gratify. Here and there individual professors or instructors at the University—in American and European history and English literature—volunteered to give extra courses on Saturdays or late in the afternoons to such persons. In 1894 these courses were organized and extended in what were known as the College Courses for Teachers. They were repetitions of regular college courses, and were given at a moderate charge at hours available to men and women occupied during school hours. Steadily increasing numbers of teachers and others made use of these opportunities, and the courses gradually increased

in number and variety till they covered the whole round of college studies. Therefore after 1906 appropriate degrees were offered, and a man or woman whose life and courage persisted long enough obtained a regular college degree. So the new phenomenon of a woman obtaining an A.B. degree at the University of Pennsylvania appeared. There was no actual restriction of these courses to teachers, and since many others took them they were long afterwards reorganized and renamed College Collateral Courses.

The establishment of the Summer School was a form of service called forth by a similar demand. In colonial times the summer vacation in the College was a single month, in the Medical School eight months. The various devices by which the medical year was lengthened—the Auxiliary School of Medicine, private medical courses, the extension of the regular courses—have been adverted to. The college year went through the opposite process, the working time was shortened, summer vacation lengthened till in colleges and private schools it was apt to be more than three months. As the century progressed the conviction that three months was too long a period for all study to be suspended became prevalent.

In accordance with this feeling, classes were occasionally organized at the University for those who wished to carry on their study during the summer. Permission could usually be obtained from the Trustees for use of the buildings. There was a summer school in Chemistry carried on by Professor E. F. Smith and some assistants in 1894 and subsequently. The American Institute of Biblical Literature held summer sessions in the eighties, and there were other instances. As the demands for higher training of school teachers became more insistent, teachers sought college courses during their vacations. Students who failed in the spring examination and needed help in preparing for reexaminations in the fall, and others wishing to complete their college courses in less than the usual four years were another group asking for entrance to college in the summer time.

A summer school was therefore opened at the University in 1904. In contrast with the occasional courses given before, there were now sixty-nine courses offered by twenty-three professors

and instructors. There was an immediate response. Professor A. H. Quinn, who has held many administrative positions, guided the early organization of the school; and year by year under successive directors it proved to be one more link of the University with a broader and broader constituency, till it has long been one of the largest departments in the University, with approximately two thousand students each summer. It is a dependency of the College, and its students are generally seekers for college degrees. It has played a large part in preparing teachers for their work. Later it also offered postgraduate teaching to advanced students anxious to make faster progress toward their Master's or Doctor's degrees. Many value the opportunity to meet teachers with high reputations. It is no light privilege for a graduate student to meet for a few weeks a man who is an authority in his field but whose winter course at some other college precludes any such opportunity. Thus the Summer School, like the Collateral Courses, became a great extension of the service of the College into new fields.

The more practical of the subjects taught in the Wharton School would obviously be useful to many young men and women engaged in business and therefore unable either to enter the regular College or Wharton School classes or to utilize the opportunities of the College Collateral Classes. Realizing this need, some of the professors in that department, especially Professor Mead, whose work in industry and private finance made him cognizant of this deficiency in means of training, offered courses to be given at the University in the evenings. These courses, which came to be known as the Evening School of Accounts and Finance, were established in 1904, the same year as the first Summer School, and two years before the Saturday classes were finally established, and like them they opened up the resources of the University to quite another class in the community. A characteristic of the Evening School was that it granted as a testimonial to work performed only a certificate of proficiency; there was no question of giving a degree. Although a high school course was considered a requisite for admission, neither the amount nor the breadth of the training given were considered to justify a regular college degree. This

was a new practice at the University, or at least one which had been known only in certain branches in the Scientific School and, at certain periods, in the Department of Arts, and was deprecated in both.

If the subjects taught in the Evening School were as useful as the enrollment indicated, there was evidently an important service to be performed if these could be carried further afield. Just after the close of Mr. Harrison's administration, in 1913, the Extension Courses in Accounts and Finance were established to fill this want. Most of the business courses given in the Wharton School, beginning with those in the Evening School, were eventually repeated in five cities of Pennsylvania—Harrisburg, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Williamsport—reasonably accessible to University professors with control of their time, but quite beyond the radius from which students engaged during business hours could come in person to the University. Many banks and other employing bodies welcomed these courses and encouraged their clerks and other employees to take advantage of them. The administrative problems of arranging for these courses once solved, other courses, in education and some academic subjects, were offered at these centers and elsewhere in somewhat the same radius, so that a veritable Extension School was established and has become a regular part of University activity. This, like the Evening School, gave certificates only, not degrees.

In these ways—Collateral Courses, Summer School, Evening Courses, Extension Courses—many hundreds, cumulatively thousands, unable to become regularly attending students in the University, have been admitted at least to the purlieus of academic life. If anyone doubts their appreciation of even this limited opportunity to become Pennsylvania men and women, let him attend some one of their group dinners or other celebrations, and if the sea of red and blue colors, the University songs, the speeches warmed by college loyalty, do not convince him that they are genuine Pennsylvania alumni, he is unresponsive indeed. These extension courses created besides a great body of influential men and women whose sympathetic support of the University is of the greatest value.

Two questions may arise in the mind of one who follows the history of the University down from its little circle of daily attending students and professors, pursuing a single curriculum, adapted to a few special lines of life and appealing to a relatively restricted body of young men, to this ever broadening and increasing University constituency. One is the question whether these new groups are really recipients of University service or are simply persons buying something from University professors and paying for what they get. The other is whether this constant expansion of University activity and multiplication of its services is a desirable line of its development. To the former it may be answered that no student of the University on or off the campus has ever paid the full money cost of the education he has received. This may be calculated. The amount of endowment by its benefactors, of unpaid administrative service performed by its Trustees, of the constant series of gifts that provide so much of its equipment, and, in these later times, of appropriation of public funds, have kept the fees of paying students much below their proportionate part of the costs of the establishment, while many free students are completely its beneficiaries. The students who pay fees for extension courses, like those who pay their regular college dues, are receiving University service much greater than they pay for.

To the second question the answer is that expansion has come so naturally and so widely throughout the University, in such evident response to the needs of the surrounding community that it has been practically irresistible. Any department which has deliberately remained stationary has dwindled, and any teacher who has clung to the old ways has lost influence and ceased to count, except as so much dead weight.

THE BABYLONIAN EXPEDITIONS

Germany was not the only country that in the later decades of last century felt a *Drang nach Osten*, an "urge toward the East"; nor was this attraction only in the economic sphere. An awakening of curiosity concerning the lands to the East of the Mediterranean seemed to be epidemic. French, German, Eng-

lish, and American scholars turned their eyes and their steps toward Babylonia, Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt. They were the lands of ancient civilization. To Christians they were, in addition to their native interest, the lands of the Old Testament and the New. Many who had but little scientific interest rejoiced in the corroboration which excavations in Mesopotamia and Egypt gave to the accuracy of the historical pictures of the biblical narrative. It was such interests that drew together a group of men and women in Philadelphia, largely under the influence of Dr. John P. Peters, Professor of Hebrew at the Episcopal Divinity School, who organized and sent an expedition to carry on research in Babylonia; especially to excavate the great mound of Nippur, long a mystery and a challenge to travelers and to oriental scholars. Four successive expeditions to this region were sent out between 1889 and 1899.

As a result of the richness and novelty of these Nippur excavations, in 1922 a twelve-year enterprise was entered upon jointly with the British Museum in excavating the site of Ur of the Chaldees, which gave still more interesting results. So, although many other parts of the world and fields of research have since attracted the activities of this group—Egypt, Etruria, Crete, Alaska, Palestine, Guatemala, and Persia—Babylonia was their first and has remained their most characteristic interest. These expeditions were sent out under the name of the University of Pennsylvania.

Their supporters were not at first closely connected with the University; it was the work of Dr. Pepper to draw them, as he drew so many others, into its sphere of influence. He joined the group, subscribed to its expenses, and as Provost of the University promised to provide a place for the preservation and display of such objects as they should collect. The Department of Semitics at the University was already strong. It was headed by Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., College '81, who after extended studies in Europe returned in 1885, and, at first as Instructor, later as Professor of Hebrew and as Librarian, was an active scholar and prolific writer. The Graduate School also maintained at least a nominal connection with Dr. Peters and with Dr. H. V. Hilprecht, the Assyriologist.

In 1889, at a meeting held in Dr. Pepper's office, the University of Pennsylvania Archaeological Association was founded with Dr. Leidy as President and Dr. Jayne, Dean of the College Faculty, as Secretary. It was to be the work of this Association, which included the large number of men and women already mentioned as keen in their interest in archaeological matters, to gather funds, to send out expeditions and ultimately to secure a building, without which a museum can hardly exist. To cement this connection, on December 22, 1891, a new department of the University was established by the Board of Trustees to be known as the Department of Archaeology and Palaeontology. This was placed under the direction of a Board of Managers some of whom were to be appointed directly by the Trustees of the University, the remainder to be nominated by the Archaeological Association then appointed by the Board. This was a plan already adopted for the Hospital, which, although in the possession of the University, was under the direction of a Board of Managers, and it was to be applied the next year to the Graduate School for Women, later to still other departments of the University. It has manifest advantages in securing the services and interest of new and influential groups of men and women; it has also the disadvantage of possible conflicts of jurisdiction. Both were to show themselves later. In 1899 the Archaeological Association and the Department of Archaeology were merged, and the connection of the proposed museum with the University thereby made an indissoluble one.

THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM

By the end of 1892 it had become evident that the Library, which was the first home of the collections made by the Archaeological Association, could never accommodate their growing mass and variety. The project was therefore entered upon of putting up a building devoted to the purpose. The initiation of this project was due largely to Mrs. Sara Y. Stevenson, who had been an active member of the Archaeological Association from the beginning, but it soon obtained the energetic support of Dr. Pepper who, on his resignation as Provost, became Pres-

ident of the Board of Managers and gave to the proposed museum most of his interest for the remaining four years of his life.

In 1894 the University obtained an additional grant of land from the city of eight acres, soon increased to twelve, which was turned over to the Managers of the Department of Archaeology for the ultimate erection of a museum building. By long effort, including obtaining a grant of \$150,000 from the state Legislature and many liberal gifts by interested parties, the building was begun in 1897 and its first section opened in the year 1899. As a memorial to her husband, who had just died, the widow of Dr. Pepper made a gift of \$50,000 to the Museum, his latest interest.

Its history since has been one of striking achievement in extending, though not even yet completing, its series of sections, in sending expeditions of research, either on its own account or in partnership with various other institutions and governments, and in the addition of the products of these expeditions to its constantly growing collections. It has received many munificent gifts and bequests both in money and archaeological material. Internally, due possibly to its irregular connection with the University, possibly to other causes, it has suffered from what seems an abnormal number of conflicts, leading to resignation, heart-burnings, and slowing up of progress; but these seem to have long passed away. Like Dr. Pepper, Mr. Harrison, who had long been deeply interested in the Museum, on his resignation from the provostship in 1910, transferred his interest to the Museum and held the presidency of its Board for many years. He made a division of the funds of the Harrison Foundation between the Graduate School and the Museum. Nothing can detract from the position of the Museum as not only a center of scientific exploration and publication but as one of those forms of University contribution of service to the community that, as before remarked, are so pronounced a characteristic of this period.

At the beginning, stress was laid on its name as the Free Museum of Science and Art. It has served its normal purpose as a place of research and of study of the early history of man

and his civilization; but it has also spared no effort to make its collections accessible and comprehensible to the public. It has been calculated that an average of five thousand persons a month visit the Museum. Free lectures have been regularly given by noted travelers, archaeologists, and others, representing the group of interests for which it stands, in a popular Saturday afternoon series and at other times. It has paid particular attention to interesting and informing children by sending them through the Museum with a guide who will point out the meaning of the things they see. Like other departments of the University, the Museum has taken its educational interests outside of its own walls. Members of its regular staff have taken objects with them for display, when there were duplicates, in the lectures they have given at schools and elsewhere. They have even loaned special collections to county historical associations throughout the state to be exhibited for two- or three-week periods in the schools to familiarize children with the main stages in human development. Small groups of children are encouraged for a slight fee to come regularly on Saturdays to work out under skilled direction some visual representation of an Egyptian temple scene or an Indian village or some other re-creation for which models are to be found in the actual materials in the Museum.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CLINIC

Far away in its subject of interest from the Museum but near enough in the nature of its combination of scientific study and teaching with a useful service to the community was the establishment in 1896 by the Department of Psychology of a clinic for the treatment of mentally retarded children. Clinics for the treatment of the ills of the body were well-established adjuncts of the University Hospital as of every large hospital; now there was to be similar provision for help in some of the chronic ills that are usually said to belong to the mind; though it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between two sides of that indissoluble whole, man.

Psychology had already split off from philosophy and was be-

coming a subject for laboratory and experimental study. It had come, at least at Pennsylvania, to be grouped with biology and physics rather than with the older contemplative and introspective approach to its problems. In 1887 there had been established by Professor James McKean Cattell, at the University, a Psychological Laboratory, copied, like so much intellectual advance of the time, after a German model—in this case the Psychological Laboratory at the University of Leipzig. It is said to be the oldest such laboratory now existing in the United States. It was characteristic of the new position of the subject that its teaching was done in two rooms in the biological building. It was in a course on child psychology given in the winter of 1895-96 by Prof. Lightner Witmer, Professor Cattell's successor, to a class principally of school teachers, that the germ of the Psychological Clinic appeared. One of these teachers described the curious case of a pupil, an intelligent boy, who yet could not learn to read. At the professor's request he was brought out for examination and became a long standing problem of much interest. Such examinations became a frequent procedure. During the summer of 1896, in a course given at the University under the auspices of the Society for the Extension of University Teaching, Professor Witmer invited the presentation of such problem children as illustrative material for the use of his class.

Thus began a flood of applicants for examination and advice concerning the retarded development of pupils brought by teachers, and children brought by parents. To the course in which these examinations were made and demonstrated before the class the name of "Psychological Clinic" was applied, a term already invented by Professor Witmer in a paper suggesting the possible usefulness of the study of psychology. In his course that opened in the fall of 1897 more children were brought than could be examined by one person and another teacher had to be appointed for that special work. Interested persons were found who contributed to the expenses of the clinic. No fees were charged; although eventually a private school was established outside the University for children and young persons requiring long training to cure their defects of speech or other physiological imperfections. In 1909 the department was re-

organized, and through the interest of Provost Harrison a special appropriation for this purpose was included in the state grant of that year.

A regular staff was built up; the clinic became, as an adjunct to research and teaching, the principal part of the work of the Department of Psychology and a recognized department of the University where several hundred children and young persons were examined every year. Its work has since extended beyond the discovery and treatment of defects that retard mental progress to vocational and industrial guidance of normal persons, both within and outside the University. The Psychological Clinic is an interesting link between pure and applied science in a previously unworked field of much social significance.

THE PROCESSION OF BUILDINGS

By the end of Mr. Harrison's administration, indeed ever since the turn of the century, it had become the fashion among architectural students and others to draw or paint representations of the group of buildings in West Philadelphia as if the housing of the University was complete or was about to become so. Of course these sketches were not photographs; they contained buildings only visible as yet to the mind's eye or to hopeful anticipation. But the number which had since 1894 become substantial realities gave quite sufficient testimony to this as a great building period. Scarcely a year had passed without its monument. The Chemical Laboratory, Houston Hall, the Gymnasium, Franklin Field, and the first sixteen houses of the Dormitory system, down to the completion of Memorial Tower, have already been mentioned. Other dormitory buildings followed: "Morgan," "Wilson," "Morris," "Rodney," "Graduate House," "the Provosts' Tower"—which meant Provost Harrison's Tower, though he refused to let his name be attached to it—twenty-eight "houses" altogether were erected during his administration. The Dental Hall of 1896, destined later, when that department had obtained its fine new building, to be transformed into the home of the Department of Fine Arts; the Law School, which was at last in 1900 provided

with the dignified home it had long deserved; the Engineering Building of 1904-06; the new Medical Buildings of 1904 and 1909, characteristically, in view of the changed methods of medical instruction, called the Medical Laboratories; and the Zoölogical Building, provided for and all but finished when Mr. Harrison resigned, though not actually finished till the next year—these furnished quite the most conspicuous and most considerable elements in the plans of the University grounds of 1910. Some buildings of the period which actually existed could hardly be shown in the plans at all, except in sketches in which buildings miles away had been in imagination transported bodily and placed where there were only substantial West Philadelphia dwelling houses to the unimaginative eye.

Such a building was the Reese Wall Flower Astronomical Observatory, located on the farm of the donor, on one of the highways leading from Philadelphia. The Observatory was erected in 1896-97, from funds received twenty years before as a bequest of his exiguous fortune by a gentleman as eccentric as his name. The will was contested by relatives and only after some years and a compromise with the contestants did the University obtain a fund making possible the erection of the building and the establishment of a professorship in astronomy.

The Observatory has been under the directorship successively of Professors Charles L. and Eric Doolittle and Professor Charles P. Olivier. During the forty-five years since its establishment it has served the purposes of instruction in astronomy, and has been a center of observation of double and variable stars and of meteors and of the publication of reports in these and adjacent astronomical fields. It has also been regularly opened at certain times to the visiting public.

Another building detached from the main group is the Evans Dental Institute. Under the will of Thomas W. Evans, an American dentist who made his fortune in Paris, there was to be established at Fortieth and Spruce streets a Museum and Dental Institute bearing his name. The Trustees under the will, seeing the difficulty of establishing a new school close to the University and with an inadequate endowment, wisely came to an agreement with the Trustees of the University with permission of the

Court, by which the University's School of Dentistry in 1912 was in effect merged with the Institute, the combined title being "The Thomas W. Evans Museum and Dental Institute School of Dentistry University of Pennsylvania." The Institute provides building and equipment; the University under a financial arrangement, provides the teaching and gives the degrees. The Institute has its own Board of Trustees, on which the University is represented.

The Wistar Institute was, like the Evans Institute, established on a separate foundation from the Board of Trustees of the University, although the University names a majority of its Board. Its building to house the old Wistar and Horner collections of anatomical specimens belonging to the University and to furnish facilities for advanced anatomical research was placed on ground given by the University and dedicated in the year 1894, being one of the last functions presided over by Provost Pepper. Its work has all been done in close coöperation with the University.

Under its successive Directors, Dr. Harrison Allen, Dr. Horace Jayne, Dr. M. J. Greenman, and the distinguished professor of neurology, Dr. Donaldson, its Board of Managers, and Advisory Board of scientific specialists, the Institute has carried on a notable body of research. Its colony of white rats with recorded pedigrees for purposes of experimentation, the Effingham B. Morris Biological Farm for provision of material for research, and the group of biological journals issued under its charge have become of constantly increasing importance.

The building of the Henry Phipps Institute for the Study of Tuberculosis, a foundation dating from 1903, is located at Seventh and Lombard streets, in a neighborhood whose suitability for the study of that dread disease is its only advantage. It was handed over to the University for its administration in 1910, the last year of Mr. Harrison's administration. The inability to include in this volume an account of the history and work of the Phipps Institute and the great foundations in the field of medicine and surgery which were still to come is a matter of sincere regret to the author. It leaves out a large and significant part of the history of the University, especially in these later

years; but limitations of time, of space, and of technical knowledge combine to make their inclusion impossible. The only alternative is a separate history of the biological and medical aspects of the University's life and development.

Before bringing to a close this outline account of the characteristic movements of the administration of Provost Harrison, it might be noted that expansion was shown not only in number of buildings and variety of services but in a marked increase in the number of students. The net total according to the Catalogue of 1894-95, the first of Mr. Harrison's time, was 2,180; by the year 1909-10 it had risen to 5,033, an average increase of some ten per cent a year. Many of these students were the fruitage of the new courses—courses for teachers, evening school and summer school courses; but many of them were accounted for by normal growth under the freer and more adaptable conditions of the time, in the Wharton School, the Graduate School, Engineering, Dentistry, Veterinary Medicine, even in the old College. In the Medical School alone was there, as a result of its advance in standards, a diminution in numbers.

THE CLOSE OF MR. HARRISON'S ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Harrison presented his resignation November 15, 1910, to take effect on the 31st of December of that year. There were many testimonials of regret and appreciation. Among them was a dinner given him by the Faculties of the University on January 18, 1911, the first to be offered by a Faculty to a Provost and the largest gathering of the teaching force of the University ever held up to that time. Representatives of one school after another, in the chronological order of the establishment of their departments, McMaster for Arts, Mills for Medicine, Newbold for the Graduate School, McKenzie for Physical Education, Donaldson for the Wistar Institute, and others testified to what Mr. Harrison had done for the group of subjects in which he was especially interested. Each brought the thanks and appreciation of his department, in what constituted a moving body of testimony. It is striking how often, in all the record of building and technical advance, appear the terms

courtesy, consideration, sincerity, devotion, esteem, admiration, affection—qualities that belong in the field of the personal rather than the professional relations of men. If therefore in the detailed narrative much has been said about Mr. Harrison's material services to the University and stress laid on financial questions, if sometimes the result of a long business career seemed to have made him hard and narrow, it must be remembered that back of these lay the wise, just, kindly and sympathetic spirit to which some of us still living can testify as the fundamental character of the twelfth Provost.

Chapter 9

PROVOST, TRUSTEES, AND ALUMNI

1910-1930

THE SECOND PROVOST SMITH

THE physician-provost and the business-man-provost having implemented the office between 1881 and 1910 with new and greater powers and achieved great results, it remained for the two scholar-provosts who successively followed them to carry on the tradition of that office till its administrative functions were so largely merged in those of the new presidency. Neither Edgar F. Smith, who was Provost from 1910 to 1920, nor Josiah H. Penniman, whose independent administration came down to June 1929, and in its modified form to June 1939, was merely a scholar. The long administrative experience of each had prepared him to a degree for the office.

Dr. Smith was a man of simple origin. His grandfather was a farmer and his brother a miller in the region of Pennsylvania settled by Germans, and his boyhood was spent in those country surroundings, largely on his grandfather's farm. There remained always something of the soil about him. His simple, ingenuous, kindly spirit, his unquestioning loyalty to the University, to his friends, to his country, to his religion and to his party, were all so manifest that everyone trusted and almost everyone loved him. He was by nature a conservative but his friendliness made him sympathize with those who held more liberal opinions, and he opposed them only regretfully. He was fortunate in being educated in one of those good rural schools that occasionally exist in unexpected places, York Academy,

founded in 1787. The portrait of its principal, Dr. Ruby, hung on the wall of his office among great chemists and the others to whom he felt he owed most. He graduated A.B. from Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg. In both school and college he was imbued with an appreciation of the classics; and in the latter, under the influence of Samuel P. Sadtler, afterwards his colleague at Pennsylvania, he gained his lifelong interest in chemistry. He went to Göttingen, for his Ph.D. and afterwards taught chemistry in one institution after another, Pennsylvania, Muhlenberg, Wittenberg, till he returned to the University in 1888 as Professor of Chemistry to succeed "Old Genth." Ten years later he became Vice-Provost on the waning of the influence of Fullerton. He was elected Provost November 15, 1910.

In the midst of the administrative work that more and more filled his time, and the writing that more and more filled his leisure—he did not know what recreation was—Dr. Smith never ceased to be a chemist. Textbooks of both inorganic and organic chemistry, the earlier ones translations from the German, some seven volumes, thirty pamphlets, and one hundred and sixty-nine separate papers, all in the field of chemistry, attest this continuing interest. He was at the same time gathering the rare books and mementos that now make up the memorial collection preserved in his name.

While he was Vice-Provost and later Provost of the University, he was president successively of many chemical and other scientific societies, President of the American Philosophical Society from 1902 to 1908, a Trustee of the Carnegie Foundation, and member of many Federal, state, and other commissions; including, characteristically, the chairmanship of the Electoral Commission for the election of President McKinley. He was awarded many distinctions and was an officer of the French Legion of Honor. His early work in chemistry concerned obscure elements and original methods of analysis and measurement, but latterly he turned his attention increasingly to the history of chemistry and the lives of the early chemists.

Provost Harrison relied more and more on his advice as Vice-Provost, and by the time of his retirement Dr. Smith had become the obvious candidate for succession to the provostship,

though many of his friends grieved to see him accept a position apparently so unsuited to his scientific type of mind, to his interests, and to his special temperament. He was elected by a unanimous vote of the Trustees but accepted the position only with hesitation. He was willing to undertake the responsibility of guiding the educational policy of the University, but stood aghast before the task of money raising which had been such a heavy burden even in the competent hands of Provost Harrison. On receiving written assurance from the Board of Trustees that he would be relieved of all financial responsibilities—an undertaking that was never carried out—he accepted the office and entered upon its duties, January 1, 1911.

Notwithstanding some question of his administrative abilities, some unfavorable comment on his political friendships, and some alumni opposition to certain lines of his policy, by sheer sincerity, honesty, singleness of purpose, and devotion to his task Dr. Smith carried through for ten years what must be considered a successful administration. His geniality, affability, and genuine interest in the interests of other men secured him friends everywhere. He entertained distinguished guests of the University with ease at his club and accepted even the formal hospitality of Philadelphia with simplicity. He could go before the state Legislature and receive a kindly and favorable hearing from the men whose votes for an appropriation to the University he was seeking. They all liked him. He was on intimate terms with a certain prominent politician whose influence in Philadelphia was generally considered harmful, but when this man visited him at his office they talked about their families, their travels, their personal interests, not about politics. His scientific eminence, these personal qualities, and his devotion made him an excellent head of the University in a period of particular difficulty. In the summer of 1919 he had a serious carbuncle which his physician assured him was due to over-work. He became weary of the labors of his office and of differences of opinion; he saw, as he said, the expenses and deficits and problems of the University sitting on the footboard as he lay in bed at night, and he wanted to get to his beloved research into the history of chemistry. He wrote and presented his resig-

nation, February 9, 1920, and after four months of expostulation and entreaty by the Trustees that he retain his office he secured their acceptance of his withdrawal, May 10, to take effect June 30, 1920.

Between the provostship of Dr. Smith and that of his successor, Dr. Penniman, occurred the curious interlude of the election of General Leonard Wood; but this can be discussed more satisfactorily later, in connection with other points of alumni policy.

PROVOST PENNIMAN

Josiah Harmar Penniman was as near the college don on the Oxford model as is likely to be found in America. Passing with credit through the usual college course at Pennsylvania to his A.B. in 1890, taking such prizes as were offered on the way, Moderator of "Philo," Editor of the *Pennsylvanian*, elected to Phi Beta Kappa, valedictorian of his class, he fulfilled the whole duty of the college student, except perhaps in athletics; but few there be that live well in those two college worlds. Receiving the Ph.D. degree in 1895, teacher for a year in a private school, coming back to the University to be successively Instructor, Assistant Professor, and Professor of English; doing excellent teaching, writing several books, making broad intellectual contacts with the world, he fulfilled also the whole duty of the college professor. But he did more, he lived the troublesome double life of so many academic men, the life of an administrator as well as of a scholar. He acted as Vice-Dean of the College, then for twelve years he was Dean, next, from 1911 to 1920, during the whole administration of Provost Smith, he was Vice-Provost. Now he was to be for nineteen years more, with a variety of titles and duties, the fourteenth Provost of the University.

Under the circumstances of Dr. Penniman's long service as Vice-Provost and as close coadjutor of Provost Smith, it was not to be expected that there would follow any immediate or great change in the University's policy. What was especially characteristic of Provost Penniman's work will appear later. But

on the whole it is not difficult to consider this whole period, from 1910 forward, at least until the administrative changes of 1930, as a unity. Much as the University has grown, greatly even as it has been transformed, in some respects, since 1910, the changes of the thirty years since that date have not been so fundamental as those between 1880 and 1910. The recent period has been not so much an era of initiation and of new directions of development as it has been one of consolidation of gains. The times under Provost Pepper, when a new department was being established every year, and those under Provost Harrison, when two or three buildings were often being erected at the same time and new ideas were coming in in a flood, were past.

Expansion and change and development there have of course been during the last three decades; when these have ceased the University will be dead; and no signs of dissolution are so far visible. There have been new buildings erected, new functions undertaken and even some new departments established, though these prove on examination in most cases to be extensions of old; but in the main the changes of this fruitful period have been internal. The new ground broken had to be worked; expansion has been along lines previously mapped out but not yet followed to their goal; the forces that have carried the University forward have been no less virile but they have been better balanced. If slowing down has recently occurred in some directions, and if the University has not in some of its phases kept up with other institutions, as is undoubtedly true, the cause is not far to seek; it is the old deficiency of endowment. As it enters upon its third century this will no doubt be relieved; it may even go through a process of rejuvenation, of which there are already signs.

THE DIVISION OF SCHOOLS

Ever since the accession of Provost Pepper to office there had been a marked tendency toward centralization in organization of the University. This was most marked in the College. One after another as new departments were established, except for those quite definitely professional, such as Dentistry and the

Veterinary School, they were grafted on to the College. There were still, with a few outlying departments, only the four schools, College, Medicine, Law, and Dentistry. Dr. Horace Jayne, who since 1884 had been engaged in organizing the Biological School, to which he had contributed considerable sums of money and for which he secured the erection of its building, became, at Provost Pepper's desire, Dean of the College. He was a man of means, of leisure, and of energy, and he proceeded to enlarge the duties of that office and to secure for the College under his deanship many forms of advance. It was no light achievement to arrange that the same hour in the middle of the day should be established as the lunch and recess hour through the whole University; he made one of the many successive and none too successful attempts to provide restaurant facilities for the growing horde of hungry students; he interested himself in many proposed new courses and reorganization of old courses.

But the organization of the College was bad. It contained too many departments quite alien to one another—as diverse as the old Department of Arts, the new Department of Science, the Wharton School, the courses in biology. These departments with their various interests and claims to attention were straining at the leash, each with its own problems to be solved and ambitions to be followed. If all its teachers, or even if only those of professorial rank attended, the Faculty became cumbersome. To avoid this, the Academic Council was formed in which the Director or head of each department or group of studies represented his colleagues. Among these there were pressures, jealousies, antagonistic actions. After twenty years the tendency was now reversed and in 1912 Dr. Smith, who believed in greater independence of each of the individual groups, by the exercise of somewhat arbitrary power, brought about partition of the old College into three divisions or schools, the College proper, that is, the old Department of Arts with some additions, the Wharton School, and the Towne Scientific School. Each now had its own Dean and organized Faculty as completely separated from the others as from the Medical or the Law Faculty.

THE DROPPING OF THE REQUIREMENT OF GREEK

One result of this division was that each Faculty, having its own objectives and its own ambitions, asserted control in its field to a degree undreamt of when educational policy had been controlled by the Board of Trustees, or even by the Academic Council. This devolution of power was demonstrated promptly in the case of the College, which under its new Dean, Arthur H. Quinn, now threw off the lethargy that has been above adverted to, and began a development quite as vigorous as that of any other department. The first important question that arose was of the requirements for the A.B. degree. Greek was still required, as it had been from the beginning. Under the elective system introduced in 1870, however, it had come about that a student in the old College who had elected Greek received the degree A.B.; if he had not included Greek in his elective courses he received the degree B.S. About twenty per cent of the Arts or College students were in the former group, about eighty per cent in the latter. It seemed a small difference on which to base so large a distinction. The Curriculum Committee, therefore, after much discussion, proposed to the College Faculty that this distinction of degrees be abolished and that all students who fulfilled the College requirements, whether their electives included Greek or not, so long as they included one of the classical languages, should receive the degree of A.B. A long contest followed in the Faculty, where after a year and a half of debate the proposal was carried by a vote of thirty-two to eight. In the Board of Trustees, whose consent had to be obtained, the opposition to such a break with the past was strong. After long discussion and repeated conferences, at such a conference with a committee of the Faculty, in 1914, a committee of three of the Board of Trustees voted two to one in favor of the change recommended by the Faculty.¹

The recommendation was thereupon accepted by the Board. It was an important decision. The vote represented not so much

¹ Long afterwards, in 1930, the requirement that a student must take either Latin or Greek was abolished, and any two languages might be chosen to fulfill College foreign language requirements.

the wish or opinion of the Board as their conviction that the time had come when on educational questions they must accept the judgment of the Faculties. Just as, since the controversy that led to the resignation of Dr. Stillé, discipline had rested by common consent in Faculty hands, and as in 1881 they had agreed that the Provost should have a free hand in administrative concerns, so in 1914 the Trustees yielded to the Faculties the final decision on questions of purely educational policy.

This had always been the case with the Medical School, and largely so with the Law, the Dental, and the newly established departments. Only the Department of Arts had been so directly under Trustee control. The old days when the Trustees had felt it incumbent upon them to arrange the curriculum, set the hours at which professors and students should attend classes, name the textbooks and attend examinations had quietly passed away. It was an enlightened recognition of changed conditions that led now to Trustee withdrawal from any detailed control of the conditions for degrees.

THE NEARING CASE

A sudden storm led to the ultimate withdrawal of the Trustees from still another field, one especially difficult and subject to controversy, namely the control of opinions expressed by members of the Faculty in the classrooms and outside. This was settled by the reaction from the so-called "Nearing case." The rising tide of interest in the problems of economic society characteristic of the modern period was necessarily reflected in the teaching in the Wharton School, and to a somewhat less extent in the College and the Law School. In some cases there was criticism by the professors and instructors of what to most of the Trustees and to many of the alumni seemed settled points of orthodox economic theory and accepted social standards. The Trustees thought it incumbent on them to see that only "sound" principles were taught in the University, and, naturally, subjecting in the classroom present conditions to free criticism and on some scores to vigorous condemnation, roused disap-

proval. Discussions gathered around proposed child-labor legislation, the claims and powers of public service corporations, many customary practices in civic and political life and educational theory; sometimes, though not often, they involved questions of orthodoxy in religion.

When criticism of generally accepted ideas was expressed outside of the classroom, disapproval was still stronger. The Dean of the Law School subjected himself to stricture by publicly advocating legislation for the recall by vote of judicial decisions. One of the professors in the College was denied publication in the official University journal of his address before the alumni of the Graduate School on "The Agitator in History" because of its "radicalism." He had pointed out the useful service agitators had performed in history by breaking up complacency, and pleaded for more attention to such criticism in our own time. When "radical" views were expressed by professors or instructors outside the University, as sometimes occurred, in such a form as to violate good taste, official disapproval was naturally felt still more strongly. The storm was brewing through the years from 1912 to 1914; so much was this the subject of the day that in 1914 certain Trustees felt called upon to issue, with some acknowledged irony, a declaration in favor of free speech and religious liberty at the University. Huxley's statement of 1874 was quoted with approval that universities should be places in which thought was free from all fetters and in which all sources of knowledge and all aids should be accessible to all concerned. Nevertheless, some of the younger teachers were warned that their dismissal might follow unauthorized teaching; others found their promotion was being retarded by reports from their students or in the newspapers of their unpopular views. A young assistant professor was threatened with immediate dismissal because of the report by one of his students of a remark he had made in the classroom—a proposal that brought about the threat of the head of his department that he would resign if such summary action was taken on an unverified and private statement. The report was thereupon explained by the teacher concerned and the matter dropped.

In this heated condition of feeling the blow fell rather unexpectedly on Dr. Scott Nearing, a popular and active young teacher of economics who had been, after some delay and with some hesitation, promoted in 1914 to an assistant professorship for a single year. On June 15, 1915, the day of the last meeting of the Board of Trustees before the expiration of his appointment, a note from the Provost informed him in rather curt terms that by order of the Trustees his appointment would not be renewed. Although the Trustees were obviously within their legal rights in terminating an appointment which had been made for only a year, the tardiness of their decision, the suddenness of their action, and their disregard of the favorable recommendation for his reappointment of the Dean and Faculty of the Wharton School, stirred up a hornet's nest.

The unfavorable public reaction was more intense when the members of the Board refused to give any reason for their action and insisted that it was purely a matter for their own decision and one in which the public was in no way concerned. As the University was at the very time appealing for a grant from the state Legislature on the ground that it was a quasi-public institution performing public services, to declare that the public had no right to an explanation of their action was an obviously illogical claim, which aroused popular and newspaper antagonism that would not have been provoked by a more open policy. Moreover, there was no doubt on the part of anybody concerned that the failure to reappoint was mainly a case of the old conflict between the conservative and the radical.

The majority of the Trustees considered Dr. Nearing, as one of them expressed it, "a liability that the University should not carry." This may be questioned. As a result of the Trustees' precipitate action and refusal to explain it, the University carried for many years, unjustly no doubt, a widespread reputation for denying that degree of academic freedom of teaching which had long since been accepted in other large universities.

At the time, notwithstanding the defensible position of the Trustees when legalistically interpreted, and their well-kept silence, the alumni and the interested part of the community

divided sharply into two camps, so that its representative and impartial position, its greatest social asset, was endangered. A number of local members of the General Alumni Society gave out a statement of approval of the action of the Trustees, and took occasion to express their condemnation of the "fallacious conclusions" of certain members of the teaching staff which when stated publicly were "likely to arouse class prejudice." On the other hand other alumni in Philadelphia and elsewhere made strong protests against the propriety of this statement and against what they called a "vigorous campaign against several progressive teachers of the University." The local newspapers, only too ready to condemn the University, entered into the controversy and almost without exception commented adversely on the action of the Trustees. The Faculty were practically a unit in disapproving it, since, however little sympathy many of them may have had for Nearing's views, they all resented the crude precipitancy of his dismissal, and found in it indication of a disparaging attitude of the Administration toward the Faculty of which there were thought to be other instances at the time.

The relation of the administration of universities and colleges to their faculties was a rising question, and but six months before the Nearing case broke out the American Association of University Professors had been formed to introduce some common agreement as to these relationships. It was particularly irritating to members of the University Faculty to have their institution used in these discussions, even if quite unfairly, as an example of antiquated and narrow practice. The Nearing case was at best a tissue of mistakes and misjudgments, of confusion between what was legal and what was just or wise, of hasty action for which there might well have been justification if it had not been so hasty. It is not at all certain that Dr. Nearing should have been reappointed to a position in the University; but neither he nor any other teacher should be abruptly separated from it without notice or discussion. Teachers are appointees, not employees of the Board.

Provost Smith, who had acted during the controversy purely as an agent for the Board of Trustees, now that it was over

persuaded them to take steps that would prevent its recurrence. A series of changes in the by-laws provided for a more orderly procedure in short appointments and placed the responsibility for removals in the case of full professors, except for the very last step, on the Faculties, where it belonged. It had become obvious that it was no longer defensible in a large and free university for the administrators to take action that laid them and their institution open to the charge of interference in the teaching given by its faculty. The faculty alone could be trusted to judge of the competency of their colleagues. Proof of the subsequent willingness of the Trustees to accept criticism without demur is shown by the publication by a member of the Faculty before the year 1915 was over of a narrative of these events certainly not unduly favorable to those who had taken the initiative in them.¹ There has been since 1915 no instance of removal without the approving judgment of the Faculty. The sequel of the Nearing case marks the abandonment by the Trustees of one more of their ancient activities. It also marks the end of a period of somewhat strained relations between the Trustees and the Faculty.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCE

When Dr. Smith became Provost January 1, 1911, the problem of finance stared him in the face. Mr. Harrison had left the University out of debt, but he had left no provision for its running expenses. Dr. Smith had declined to accept the provostship unless he should be relieved of the burden which had lain so heavily on the shoulders of the last two Provosts. This relief was promised to him, but no effective steps were taken by the Trustees to carry out their agreement. As a matter of fact, Dr. Smith himself was probably the only man then able, although reluctant, to draw on what seemed under the circumstances the only available source of sufficient funds for the maintenance of the University, the state treasury. Many friends of the University looked with disfavor on this form of support, but they did not supply or suggest any practicable alternative,

¹ Lightner Witmer, *The Nearing Case*, New York, 1915.

and money must be found immediately. Moreover, appeals for state aid and arguments for its propriety had already under the administrations of Provost Pepper and Provost Harrison been so frequent and so successful that another application would be no novelty.

This matter of state grants to the University has played so large a part in discussion and policy during recent years that a résumé of their history may be apposite. The University of the State of Pennsylvania was supported almost entirely by state funds. After 1791 the Trustees of the University had applied with full expectation of success to the state government for the support which the act of union of 1791 had seemed to promise them, an understanding which was supported by the use of the name of the state, by the fact that the Governor was *ex officio* President of the Board, and by the requirement that they should every year lay a statement of their financial condition before the Legislature. This last requirement has been fulfilled through good report and ill report almost without intermission since that date. But the Legislature was by no means so regularly willing to make appropriations. The applications of 1792 and 1793 brought no favorable response.

In 1807 the state granted, on conditions, as has already been told, a nominal sum of \$3,000, in the form of relief from payment of the last instalment of the amount owed to the state by the University on the purchase price of the "President's House." In 1838 the Legislature approved an annual sum of \$1,000 for ten years to each university in the state maintaining five professors and instructing one hundred students. It was understood that this was the only such institution, and the University received the benefit of this grant for five years. In 1843 the state was in such financial difficulties that it reduced the amount to \$500, and afterwards ceased to pay altogether. In 1868 the University applied to the state government for the product of the sale of the land scrip recently given by the Federal government, agreeing to fulfill the requirements of that grant. The money was, however, as already stated, given elsewhere. The Trustees gradually and reluctantly gave up the hope of state support; and the belief that the University was or should be in any sense

or to any degree a state-supported institution gradually died away.

The move to West Philadelphia marked a new era of state grants to the University. Appropriations were made from time to time for specific objects which might be considered of a public nature. In 1872, by the efforts of Dr. William Pepper, grants of \$200,000 were obtained for the University Hospital on condition that the same amount should be obtained from private donors, and that fifty-five beds be kept up for citizens of the Commonwealth; repeatedly since that time state money has been given for building or other needs of the Hospital. In 1889 \$12,500 was granted to the Veterinary Hospital for research on the diseases of animals, and grants have since been made at various times to the Department of Veterinary Medicine for building and other objects. The state made grants, as has been told, to the Museum, and during a decade it gave successive sums for the purchase of books for the Library.

THE ERA OF PRIVATE SUPPORT

But none of these appropriations were for the regular maintenance of the University. They belonged rather to the class of special gifts, some public, some private, some for specific purposes, some for general expenses, that were being so successfully obtained during their two administrations by Dr. Pepper and Mr. Harrison, those princely beggars for noble causes. Themselves men of wealth and liberality who set an example of generous giving, having contacts with men and women of wealth of all groups in the labyrinth of Philadelphia society, they were in a position to teach Philadelphians a lesson they had long neglected to learn, that is, to give to their own University. Under the devoted and ingenious efforts of these two Provosts, for many years gifts to the University rose to more than half a million dollars a year, in some years to nearly a million.

These gifts corresponded mainly to the respective interests of the donors in the various phases of University life, and it was largely the increasing variety of these activities that drew new givers of the funds necessary for their support. They gave

where they were interested. But part of the flood of individual contributions was due to the greater interest and kindlier feeling in the community toward the University as a whole. For the first time since its earliest days the local community began to feel that it was their University, and to take pride in its usefulness and greatness. Dr. Stillé believed that this change of attitude had already begun in his time and that an independent Provost, able to speak for the University, could exploit the change; but this power was denied him. Now that the Provost was the actual head of the University, and able to speak for it as fully as any college president could represent his institution, such powers of explanation, of persuasion, and of appeal to college and local loyalty as he possessed had full opportunity for use.

Both Dr. Pepper and Mr. Harrison were, as has been intimated, past masters in this art. The number of individual givers of considerable sums rose in some years to three hundred and even four hundred persons. Lists of these donors, when Mr. Harrison was chairman of the Committee on Property, when he was Provost, and after his resignation, when his interest was turned largely to the Museum, were, with his meticulous attention to detail, carefully kept, and still lie with their signed promises of the donors among Mr. Harrison's papers. On the lists are of course confirmed repeaters, such as Mr. J. G. Rosen-garten, LaBarre Jayne, Dr. and Mrs. Pepper, Mr. and Mrs. Harrison, the Houston family, the Misses Blanchard, and many other generous givers whose names are encountered, giving for all sorts of purposes. There appear, cheek by jowl, subscriptions of a hundred thousand dollars, or fifty or ten or five thousand, with modest contributions of ten or twenty dollars, for purposes that appealed especially to the givers or which they had been convinced were for the benefit of the University. In this way, the new departmental buildings, successive additions to the Dormitories, the Museum, and other buildings were erected and the campus beautified. By other funds similarly collected, special salaries were paid and in certain departments and at certain times increased, publications were provided for, fees for lectures furnished, funds for needy students collected,

and ever recurring "maintenance funds" and "deficiency funds" contributed to. Mr. Harrison claimed, correctly, that no calendar year in his administration closed with a deficit, and that the budget was always balanced at the end of the fiscal year; but this was accomplished only by a constant and vigorous campaign of seeking private contributions.

Mr. Harrison was in the habit of carrying printed forms of subscription for various University objects, laid in black covers, in his pocket to be brought out and submitted to prospective donors. Semi-mythical and semi-humorous stories went the rounds of the panic of well-to-do persons on seeing Mr. Harrison approach, realizing that before their interview was over their names would be duly signed in his famous "little black book" promising a contribution to some University purpose. Many records of such salutary experiences of Philadelphia citizens still lie in the University archives, almost invariably annotated "pd." A variation is the story of a good Philadelphia Quaker, a Trustee, who was asked to contribute \$10,000 to a certain object. He took the matter under advisement, then sent \$5,000, with the explanation that he knew he would grudge giving the larger sum but could give \$5,000 cheerfully, and "the Lord loveth a cheerful giver."

THE ERA OF STATE GRANTS

Devoted as were the labors of the successive Provosts and others engaged in these collections, and generous as was the spirit in which these gifts were made, certain doubt could hardly fail to arise whether it was a practicable or defensible way of meeting the regular long-range expenses of a great and growing institution. Such doubts were assailing the minds of the Provost and Trustees, the Faculty and alumni, at the very time the tide of contributions asked for and received was still running high and providing the facilities that have been described. Mr. Harrison frequently asked, though seldom receiving a favorable reply, for pledges to pay so much a year for three or five or even ten years.

It was doubtless in response to the feeling of need for some-

thing more permanent that, scattered among the appropriations for specific objects asked for and obtained from the state government, occasionally appears an item simply for maintenance of the University. This was a return to ancient practice. The applications read in some cases almost verbally the same as those of 1792 and the immediately succeeding years. The first such general grant in later times seems to have been in the first year of Mr. Harrison's administration. The members of the Legislature were invited to visit the University, and a large number accepted and were entertained there April 19, 1895. An appropriation of \$200,000 was made the next July, and the pen with which the Governor signed the bill was placed in the University Library. In 1897, \$150,000 was given for general maintenance. In 1899 and 1901 the grants were for the Hospital only, not for maintenance. State appropriations in Pennsylvania are made every other year for a two-year period.

The ties that bound the University to the state government were drawn closer in 1903 by the election to the governorship of Judge Pennypacker, long a Trustee, and always an advocate of closer relations of the University with the state. In his inaugural address at Harrisburg he promised to restore the old close relations and "to regain and retain for the state the credit for this early and unprecedented recognition of the cause of learning." In March of that year the members of the Legislature again visited the University, and in the fall a small appropriation for general maintenance was made; a larger one was for the specific object of aid in the building of the new Medical Laboratory. In every session since 1903 in the biennial appropriations voted by the Legislature has been included an item for the maintenance of the University. In the passage of these appropriation bills the services of Dr. Smith while he was Vice-Provost were invaluable. His genial relations with the legislators at Harrisburg, many of them plain men with whom he loved to talk about country matters, brought them to him, rather than finding it necessary that he should seek them, and made them ready to do what he asked as a personal favor even when they had little enthusiasm for a distant institution of higher learning.

This was the practice in state appropriations when Dr. Smith became Provost. Finding no financial support from Trustees or alumni, and feeling little capacity or inclination for the personal appeals that had been so fruitful under his predecessors, he turned perforce to the Legislature for that large part of the income of the University not provided by the fees of its students, or by solicitation, or produced by its few endowment funds. The appropriation signed by Governor Tener in the first year of Dr. Smith's administration, 1911, was something over twice as large as any previous appropriation, being but slightly less than a million dollars for the next two legislative years. The appropriation of 1913 was more than a million, three-quarters of it for general maintenance. The grant for 1915 was somewhat smaller, but in 1917 and 1919 and to the end of Dr. Smith's provostship and afterward appropriations by the state were made, as has been said, at every legislative session and for a time in constantly increasing amounts. The practice has become a well-established one and, although a special application has to be made at each session of the Legislature, the principal question in recent years has been the strength of the relative claims of the University and the other educational institutions that receive state aid.

Although these biennial appropriations had become indispensable, and in productiveness were the next item to students' fees, the stream of private giving had by no means dried up. Alumni and other friends of the University still responded to specific appeals; funds were voluntarily given on the Provost's gentle reminder of old promises being due, for continuing objects or for general expenses; and there were some welcome bequests and endowments. The Duhring bequest of more than \$900,000, received in 1913, was the largest that had ever come to the University. The generosity of alumni continued to be counted on, or rather, the University and the alumni, as will be seen, went into partnership in this field in 1924 for all funds except endowments and students' fees.

A private memorandum on a slip of paper in his own handwriting lies among Dr. Smith's papers with the characteristic heading, "To the Heavenly Father—thanks for these," on

which he lists some forty recent gifts to the University, including state appropriations, various sums from five hundred to fifty thousand dollars, for purposes varying from contributions to the "deficit fund" and the "fund for needy students" to a gift of \$500 from Mr. Rosengarten to pay for printing the Schoolmen's Week program, \$1,500 from H. R. Hatfield to pay expenses of the Saturday lecture course, or from Mrs. Syms \$25,000 and from Mrs. Prevost \$200,000 for medical research, or \$25,000 from "Bauer's Boys" and \$1,000 from "Will Bauer," or \$350 from "Billy Hulme," or one of the many \$5,000 gifts for unrestricted use. These and other generous gifts from generous people evidently warmed the heart of the Provost. It is a list corresponding to Mr. Harrison's "black book," characteristic of the two men and of the times. This constant flow of gifts was an occasion for genuine gratitude on the part of all connected with the University; but, as remarked at an earlier time, a régime of gifts as a systematic source of supply of funds had evident weaknesses. There was to come a time when the alumni would appear on the scene in a serious effort to introduce an element of greater regularity as well as of adequacy, but other occurrences intervened which must first be recounted.

THE WORLD WAR

It is impossible to proceed far in the chronicle of this period without finding the University for the third time in its history enmeshed in the complications of war. At no time in its life probably was the University floating on a more even keel or sailing more prosperously forward than in the years just preceding the entrance of the United States into the World War. *Old Penn*, the semi-official university weekly of the time, gives perhaps a fairer impression of the real University than more formal records furnish. An examination of its files for the years from 1912 to 1917 shows a steady and wholesome growth in numbers, and additions of new and valuable members to the staff, as death or retirement created vacancies or the growth of one department or another demanded more instructors. The various departments were at work at their normal tasks, learned so-

cieties were meeting here, and our own professors were taking their fair share, perhaps more than their fair share, considering their teaching duties, in the general activities of the academic world. The alumni were becoming more interested and, as already stated, were drawing closer among themselves and their alma mater.

Of course the finances were in an unsatisfactory state. It would not have been Pennsylvania if this had not been so. Its history has been a continual conflict with poverty. Mr. Harrison's boast that no year in his administration closed with a deficit could, it is true, no longer be made, but the biennial grants from the Legislature and other sources of income were doing much to fill the gaps. Moreover a Provost of the University, not Mr. Harrison, had once said that a university ought to be ashamed not to be spending more than its income. Its possibilities of usefulness were so great that it should undertake its tasks first and seek the funds for them afterwards. This bold policy was again being followed, though without Provost Pepper's *sang-froid*.

It was into this peaceful progress that came, as twice before, the intrusion of war. Notwithstanding its short duration the World War cut deeper into University life than had either the Revolution or the Civil War. Participation of students and professors in the earlier wars was left largely to their own discretion; now the government took control of the situation. Before the United States entered the war in 1917 many students and some professors had volunteered in the service of one or another country with which they sympathized, or had returned, in response to summons, to serve those countries of which they were still citizens. A course in military science and tactics had been established, with requirements prescribed by the War Department, under the Federal Law passed in June 1916. The students who took this course, as an elective with physical training, in the undergraduate schools were known as the Reserve Officers Training Corps; they received certain pecuniary and other advantages and, on its completion with recommendation from the authorities, became second lieutenants in the Officers Reserve Corps.

Between the declaration of war in the spring of 1917 and the opening of college in the fall of the year, the government established here as elsewhere a Students' Army Training Corps and entered into a contract with the Trustees for the support and instruction of the students in training. The Corps at the University contained 2,440 men, and was supplemented by a naval unit containing 450 men. These students were enlisted, under direct control of the United States authorities and given free tuition, clothing, board, and lodging, besides their regular pay as soldiers or sailors. The costs to be paid by the government were estimated at \$231,000, but payment of about \$200,000 was finally accepted by the University.

Under orders from the War Department, a number of classes were organized in different departments suited to the various arms of the service in which the men were enrolled. Out of the 480 students in the Medical School 250 were already in 1917 enlisted in the Medical Enlisted Reserve Corps and twelve were already in the Naval Reserve Force, and of the graduating class in medicine all but twenty were already in the Medical Reserve Corps. So many men had enlisted from the Law School, which had no regular military training course, that at one time there were but eleven students and teachers together in the department. Dormitories and fraternity houses were largely turned over to members of the Students' Army Training Corps. Various concessions as to absence from college were made for those who enlisted in the service of the United States. "War Aims" courses were drawn up under approval of the government and delivered by the professors to the students. Drilling was constant; khaki was the order of the day. Those who from extreme youth, infirmity, or other causes were not subject to the draft, and therefore did not wear uniform, became conspicuous. It was in contemplation by the government, if the war had lasted a few weeks or months longer, for reasons of morale to put into uniform members of the Faculty, at least those who took part in the instruction of the Students' Army Training Corps, which included almost all professors and instructors. There were scattered cases of objectors to the war, but in the case of professors, who mostly remained silent, their

known opinions were respected and they were not molested; and students were treated individually by the government.

All these arrangements were temporary, and shortly after the Armistice the Students' Army Training Corps was demobilized and the regular college order of exercises resumed. In 1922 the Adjutant General of the United States Army issued a certificate in recognition of the services of the University in establishing the Students' Army Training Corps. The Reserve Officers Training Corps, known familiarly as the R.O.T.C., which had disappeared when the S.A.T.C. came in, was reconstituted in 1918 and has remained permanently in existence but, as it has not been compulsory, has not played a conspicuous part. The services and personal experiences of men connected with the University either as students, professors, or graduates, corresponding to the many-sided interests which now bound the University to the community in war time as in peace time, are too varied, numerous, and recent to follow up here. The participation of the University in the late war, like so many other aspects of our history, still awaits its special annalist.

There was one unexpected and far-reaching result of the war. Whatever the explanation, Pennsylvania, like all other universities and colleges in the United States, experienced immediately after the war a sudden and striking increase of applications for admission. Instead of making as formerly a reserved but no less real effort to obtain students, now it seemed necessary to protect the University against an inundation of students. The University kept up, indeed in some directions increased its requirements for admission, but its total enrollment still continued to increase. This growth of numbers had begun before the war. At the beginning of Provost Harrison's administration the total enrollment in the University was slightly over two thousand; at its close sixteen years later, it was above five thousand; the year the United States entered the war it was just below nine thousand; in the year of its close, the numbers rose to more than eleven thousand. This increase therefore was obviously the result not only of war influences but of the many new lines of contact the University had established during the last quarter-century, as well as of the growing repute of the older departments. The Whar-

ton School, the Summer School, the Evening School, the Extension Courses, the College Courses for Teachers, the increased numbers in the College, now that it had one degree for all its students and had set up the premedical, predental, and prelaw courses, the widespread appeal of the Graduate School, the current setting of the flow of students from so many directions toward the School of Architecture, the graduate courses in the Medical and Law schools, all combined to swell the number of the student body, even before the war. To this increase was now added the new demand for education caused by the war, springing from the determination of young men and of their parents that in the next war they or their sons should be officers, not privates. This brought them flocking to the colleges and universities. Others consider the post-war depression that drove men out of all occupations except university study to have been the principal cause of increase. Whatever its cause, after the two years of war the University had two thousand additional students.

THE DISSATISFACTION OF THE ALUMNI

It was this great increase of numbers and its democratic sources that drew the unfavorable attention and ultimately the active interposition in the administration of the University of a large and influential body of the alumni. Alumni opinion is an elusive spirit. No one has ever yet found the average alumnus, and no institution has ever been able to round up a body of alumni that corresponds at all closely in judgment with the mass of graduates. The devoted group of those who join the alumni societies, pay their dues, attend meetings, serve in office and on committees, take and read the college and alumni journals, and occasionally visit their old surroundings are an interesting body that can never be disregarded or undervalued by any body of administrators and teachers; but no careful observer believes that they reflect the considered opinions of the great body of graduates. They are generally more conservative than the graduates in general, than the students, and, strange as it may seem, than the faculty. Yet they are the only ascertainable bond that binds the University to its past, and they are

its natural recourse for loyalty, encouragement, and material support. It is nevertheless wise to think of them as the organized society of the alumni, not as identical with the graduates, many of whom hold quite different views.

As has been noted above, the alumni organizations and the administration and Faculties of the University had been drawing closer and closer. It was a reciprocal movement. Provost, deans and prominent professors frequently attended and spoke at alumni gatherings. Dr. Penniman especially, as Dean, as Vice-Provost, and after he became Provost, made it a constant practice to report on University affairs to bodies of the alumni and spent a great deal of time in travel for this purpose. Correspondingly the Central Committee of the Alumni and the General Alumni Society, in addition to their other activities exercised a certain amount of advisory influence on the Board of Trustees by nominating and securing the election of one member after another to the Board. Between 1885 and 1913 they placed ten members on the Board, and in their reports they made many suggestions on University affairs. In 1913 the Central Committee and the General Alumni Society were merged, and the latter thereby became the active representative body of the organized alumni with an office and permanent secretary in Philadelphia. In 1911 William A. Redding, a New York lawyer, elected in that year President of the General Alumni Society, had set himself the task of bringing the scattered local alumni bodies together. The basis of unity was found largely in the encouragement and support of Pennsylvania athletic teams especially when away from home. Mr. Redding remarked, "There is nothing which gives to a university a wider reputation than intercollegiate athletics, and there is nothing which arouses so much enthusiasm among the graduates and undergraduates as intercollegiate sports." But there was also the object of working for the University generally, not without the idea of exercising an influence over its policy. "Alumni unity is absolutely essential to make our claim a powerful force for the good of our university."

By 1913 unity, or at least alliance, was by the efforts of Mr. Redding and Mr. William McClellan successfully accomplished.

The local alumni societies were brought together into a general federation, the Associated Pennsylvania Clubs. In contrast with the General Alumni Society, the Federation had no continuous existence. It met as an annual conference, in a different city each year, and was expected to discuss general matters of interest brought up by representatives of the sixty or eighty local and other separate organizations of alumni, and to appoint committees which should report to the next conference. It was in these conferences that the dissatisfaction with the condition and tendencies of the University to which reference has been made became evident. Along with much that was appreciative and constructive there was much that was critical. The rapid increase in numbers of the University, its growing dependence on state appropriations, its development, since the beginning of the century, into a great many-sided, democratic institution, in which the College was only one of many departments, drawing its students largely from distant regions yet subject to the influences of its location in a large industrial city, were all displeasing to many members of the alumni societies. The University, even the College, was drawing into its student body the more ambitious boys of the city masses and in its other departments ever more and more yielding to the pleas for admission of women, however rigorously they were excluded from the College proper. Through the Extension and Evening Schools and Saturday classes it was serving and including classes of the community that had before had no access to its opportunities, and it necessarily came to reflect to a certain extent these interests.

TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP

On account of the war there were no conferences of the Associated Clubs in 1917, 1918, and 1919, but at the fifth conference, held in Wilmington, Delaware, in February 1920, the report of the Committee on the Welfare of the University called attention to many points of criticism, proposed a drastic alteration in the direction of the University's progress, and recommended the formation of a committee of one hundred alumni

to confer with the Board of Trustees regarding the policies of the University.

The chief proposals of the Welfare Committee were that the number of students and variety of courses should be reduced, that women should be more completely excluded, that extension and evening courses and all courses that did not lead to degrees should be abandoned, and that an endowment fund should be raised so that the dependence of the University on state appropriations should be unnecessary and the danger of Pennsylvania becoming a state university be avoided. Each of these proposals was supported by a statement of reasons and of the ideals it was proposed to substitute for what they considered the lowering existing tendencies. These statements were of course permeated with much inadequate information and unnecessary dread of possibilities. Those who had taken the old-fashioned Arts course might have remembered Tacitus' observation that *omne ignotum pro magnifico*; and that greater numbers did not necessarily mean less scholarship. The University was not really, as they came afterward to learn, in the parlous condition they feared. Those who attended these conferences, took part in these discussions, and favored these recommendations were for the most part able and thoughtful men and represented a genuine interest in the University and devotion to what they considered her higher welfare. But they were insufficiently informed as to the facts, and many of them were dominated by a desire that the University should be, like some country college, what she had never been and could never be, an oasis of quietude, dignity, culture, and withdrawal from the throbbing life of the community that surrounded her and the modern time in which she lived.

In an Alumni Day address, February 21, 1919, Provost Smith had quite unintentionally provided a slogan for those who felt these fears and held these views. Speaking of the problems of education after the war he declared, "I firmly believe that the thing the University should do is to educate for leadership." He went on to explain that by this he meant that students in all departments of the University should be required to take

the College course first. Students in chemistry, in engineering, in medicine, in dentistry, in the Wharton School, should have a college degree before they entered any of those departments. "By having a college degree and then going into another department and getting a technical degree . . . we will send out a superior lot of men." He acknowledged that for a few years it would greatly reduce the number of students, but soon "parents will begin to see the work that we are doing and they will say, 'I want my son educated for leadership, and I will send him to the University of Pennsylvania.'"

He had no idea of choosing a special type of men for admission to the University. He would not have limited the number or sought to test the quality beyond the ordinary entrance examinations, of those entering the College; rather the contrary. He would have admitted students rather freely and tested them afterwards. His prescription for leadership was long training, first in the College, then in the professional or technical school. His whole philosophy of life was opposed to any limitation of opportunity.¹

On the other hand, by many of the alumni "training for leadership" was immediately seized upon and pitted against "mass education," as though it meant training only of those destined by ability or opportunity to be leaders in society. That may have been a defensible ideal but it had nothing to do with Dr. Smith's "training for leadership," and should not be attributed to him. The question had come up long before. In 1894 the witty and wise Horace Howard Furness, the Shakespearean scholar, a Trustee, speaking of the University, said:

Its first endeavour is not to turn out leaders in politics or in the arts, any more than it is the object of a cook to make fat men. Leadership will come in the fullness of time to those of its graduates who are leaders by the grace of God. . . . It should be a training school for every faculty with which nature has endowed us. Every pathway should be made a thoroughfare. After the University's work is done and its students have been led forth (in its true derivative sense educated) from the darkness of ignorance, all future careers, whether as

¹ His address is published in the *Alumni Register*, March 1919, pp. 428 ff.

leaders, as followers or as mere nonentities, must be left to circumstances and to that formula on which every man's temperament is based.

Or, as a certain college administrator remarked, "There can be no school for generals." Nature picks out her own leaders; and usually much later in life than the date of entering or even leaving college. Essentially "mass education" and "education for leadership" should be synonymous: the University should educate as many as she can properly accommodate. If she shall be fortunate enough to have trained some who are destined to genuine leadership, they will be the wiser leaders because of her training. A later Provost testified sadly that he had found no way of knowing beforehand who would become leaders.

Yet those of the alumni and Trustees who advocated "education for leadership" in a sense opposed to "education for the masses" as an ideal for the University, even if the expression was not what Dr. Smith meant, might well believe that young men with a superior inheritance or promise, either of money, of vigor, of health, of mental equipment, or of family, social, or political influence, would as a matter of fact be more apt to be given or to secure positions of executive responsibility in later life than those without these advantages. The idea that the University would do better to educate this special class whose social or economic position or superior gifts enabled them to look forward to careers of prominence seemed to receive support from the example of Oxford, whose graduates, under the aristocratic organization of English society, have been traditionally given appointments to positions of responsibility and power, and whose performance has a record of greater excellence in bulk, though hardly in distinction, than that of Englishmen of native genius unaided by university influence. It was an attractive analogy, so two professors, Crawford and McClelland, were sent by the University in 1930 to visit the two older English universities in search of suggestions that might be of value in reconstructing the educational work of the College. They did not, however, visit those new and vigorous provincial British universities, situated usually in large cities,

more representative of modern democracy, whose problems and characteristics are much more like our own.

THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED

The Committee of One Hundred, provided for at the Wilmington conference in February 1920, was appointed, organized itself and held three successive meetings in that year. More than ninety per cent of the members had graduated from the College, more than sixty per cent were from Philadelphia, and most of them had already taken a definite position in alumni affairs. It was not well organized therefore to take a wide University or national point of view, or to suggest much that was new. It was almost sure to look backward rather than forward, to look on problems from a College rather than a University point of view. It is particularly hard, as this writer can testify, for a College man to realize that his department is only one of several that make up the University, and for a native Philadelphian to throw off local inhibitions. The Committee went promptly to work and appointed two important sub-committees, one on the choice of a Provost, Dr. Smith having resigned in the spring, the other on University policy.

The first took high ground. General Leonard Wood, a well-known officer and an attractive personality, after a career of distinction in the army and in administration, was now retired and available for some civil appointment. It occurred to this committee, anxious that the University should receive more recognition, that General Wood might be elected to the vacant provostship and thus give it new distinction. They wrote to the Trustees that if they would accept this suggestion it would, as they said, "establish and maintain harmonious relations between the Trustees and the body of the Alumni" and "would open a new era of constructive progress in the history of the University." It would also guarantee freedom of the University from control by the state, of which there was then some dread.

A committee of the General Alumni Society secured General Wood's tentative consent to accept the position if it were offered him and arranged an informal meeting with some of the

Trustees, at which the conditions at the University were explained to him. A special meeting of the Board of Trustees was thereupon held February 28, 1921, at which some of the interested alumni were present. Mr. Wickersham, a member of the committee, presented the name of General Wood as "a man who would command universal respect, a national figure whose selection would be a financial strength, and a great administrator who can bring the University safely through its present crisis." At the same meeting Mr. George Wharton Pepper, chairman of the committee of the Board of Trustees appointed to make nominations for the vacant provostship, presented eight names, among them that of Dr. Penniman, who had been elected Acting Provost immediately after Dr. Smith's resignation and had continued to act in that capacity through this whole series of events.

The Trustees present agreed to the election of General Wood. He was offered a salary much higher than had ever been paid a Provost before, a liberal contingent fund and the use of the house which had been lately bought as a residence for the Provost. There was some question about his title, but it was arranged that it should make clear his position as head of the University, and that Dr. Penniman should be asked to remain as Acting Provost or with some other title indicating that he was in charge of the University's educational interests. This action of the Trustees was confirmed at a full meeting April 18, 1921. Some months later it was arranged that General Wood's title should be President, and Dr. Penniman was thereupon elected Provost. There was no clear differentiation of powers, except that the President was to be head and the Provost to be in charge of more purely educational affairs.

Immediately after his election in April 1921 began a correspondence lasting for two years between the Trustees, anxious to have the new appointee come to Philadelphia to take up his duties, and General Wood, seeking successive leaves of absence while he accepted and continued to serve in the high office of Governor-General of the Philippines. Interested and sharing in the correspondence were Secretary of War Weeks, speaking for President Harding, who desired General Wood's retention

for a time of his post in the Philippines, and the General Alumni Society, pressing for the grant of the leaves of absence asked for by General Wood. There were also the University Faculties, who were filled with consternation at the prospect of a chief executive necessarily ignorant of the educational problems of the University, and fearful of greater emphasis on military training. The Faculty petitioned the Trustees to accept the anticipated resignation of General Wood; they declared that the head of the institution should be a man versed in education, familiar with the problems of the University, of broad views and vigorous initiative, a description which clearly enough indicated a preference for Dr. Penniman. Successive dates for the arrival at the University of the new head were set and then postponed; the Trustees became more and more impatient until, upon their insistence that General Wood must come to take up his duties by January 1, 1923, he resigned, December 18, 1922.

The resignation of General Wood left the University with the vacant office of President which had no defined duties different from those of the Provost, on its hands, and with Provost Penniman actually fulfilling the duties traditionally attached to the old title. The simplest way out was chosen by electing Dr. Penniman, October 15, 1923, President as well as Provost. Three years later, in 1926, the title of President was abolished, to be re-created four years later for President Gates.

THE FINEGAN PLAN

A serious question was precipitated upon the sub-committee on policy. A rising difficulty had faced the University in recent years from the competition of the University, State College, and the University of Pittsburgh for state aid. They all received grants from the Legislature, but at each session there was doubt, rivalry, and sometimes contention as to how much each should have. Dr. Thomas E. Finegan, State Superintendent of Instruction, suggested as a means of overcoming this difficulty that a State Board of Education should be appointed clothed with the power to distribute the state appropriations for higher

education, and with some concomitant powers of restriction on its uses. This proposal when announced in the newspapers roused expressions of intense disapproval among the alumni and seemed to justify their fear that accepting appropriations would ultimately lead to control of the University by the state. The sub-committee on policy took this as an occasion not only to expostulate with the Trustees against putting Pennsylvania in the position of a state university but to reverse the whole process of carrying on the process of "mass education" in which the University was engaged, believing this to have resulted from the state connection.

They proceeded to make a formal report, with eight specific recommendations, which would have made many changes. They may be summed up in Point Four, "The revision of all courses of undergraduate study with a view to education for leadership." This report was repeated in its main terms at the New York conference in 1921 and corresponding resolutions were adopted, presented by Mr. Wickersham, of the Law class of 1880, and supported by former Provost Harrison and others.

The Trustees, among whom there was much the same division of opinion as among the alumni, appointed, February 9, 1920, a committee on University policy of which George Wharton Pepper was chairman. As the differences of opinion developed, the Faculties, troubled by the danger of losing state appropriations and thus cutting off many of the most useful parts of the University's work, somewhat nettled at the patronizing tone used by some of the alumni critics, and dreading what seemed the uninformed and reactionary policy being advocated also, met and appointed a committee on University policy. The possibility of becoming a state university, though not advocated or desired, had no special terrors for the Faculty. Several members were graduates or had taught in or had taken their advanced degrees at Michigan or Wisconsin or California or Kansas or Illinois or some other state university of quite equal standing with our own, while those who were Pennsylvania graduates had taught in summer schools or had given special lecture courses at state universities. All met on common ground in scientific organizations, and their superior oppor-

tunities for research were often objects of envy. Nor did experience or observation require considering state support as involving state control. Faculties in state institutions seemed generally quite as free from interference as in privately supported universities and colleges. In the University's own history there had been a period when it was a state university, and its very name of University was an inheritance from its state connection. Its Trustees had frequently tried in early times to make that connection closer.

Among these three committees and within the Board of Trustees a year of controversy ensued. Tense meetings were held and close votes in the Board taken. In March 1920 an informal conference was held with a group of presidents of Pennsylvania colleges and universities, with enlightening results. An incidental result of this conference was the acknowledgment of the University as the head of advanced educational activity in the state. Protests were sent in in shoals by business men, bankers, railroad officials, former students, and other citizens of inland Pennsylvania cities, as well as from Philadelphia, against the alumni proposal to abandon the Extension Courses and the Evening School. On the other hand there were appeals by wire and letters from organized branches of the alumni to the Trustees urging them to accept the recommendations of the Committee of One Hundred.

Mr. Pepper in his key position as chairman of the Trustees' committee was able by his moderation, his clarity of exposition and his fairness and, by no means least, by his suavity, to do much to bring order out of confused impressions and opinions. He warned the alumni that it would require an endowment fund of an amount estimated at from ten to fifty millions to enable the University to dispense with state aid. The University could not suspend its operations while this vast sum was being collected, and the courses the alumni proposed dropping were just those which were nearly self-supporting and whose suspension would do little to make smaller the deficit. The only reductions that would make the cost of carrying on the University very much less were just such changes as the alumni would

be the last to advocate and the Trustees could not seriously contemplate.

Genuine devotion to the University on the part of all made conflict less bitter and acceptance of defeat, postponement, or compromise easier. Mr. Pepper made a notable address at the conference in New York in 1921, which with its optimism, its appeal to loyalty, and its eloquence exerted a deep impression. An equally significant address was made by Provost Penniman before the Committee of One Hundred at its meeting in Philadelphia in February 1923. At the request of the chairman of the Committee he appeared before them to answer a series of criticisms of the policy of the Trustees who did not seem to be following the recommendations of the Committee as they had hoped. He answered also a barrage of questions submitted to him after his address. The information and explanations given in Dr. Penniman's speech, the inside view of the University's proceedings in those respects which especially interested the College alumni, and his ready and judicious answers to the questions of members of the Committee did much to make the discussion a practical and realistic one.

The net effect of the discussions was that there was a change in emphasis rather than in conditions. The "Finegan Plan" was disclaimed and there has been no change in the relation of the University to the state. The desire of the alumni that they should be better represented on the Board of Trustees, and its membership drawn from a wider area than was indicated by the presence of twenty-one Philadelphians among its twenty-four members, was acceded to. In the next two years four nominees of the alumni were elected, two of them from other regions, and in 1928 changes were introduced by which one-quarter of the Board regularly represented the alumni. The suggestion that a general survey of the University covering finances, administration, education, and social life, to be made by outside investigators, which had emerged during the discussion, was carried out in 1924 and an interesting report presented which has, unfortunately, had less influence than might have been hoped.

On the other hand the more specific changes advocated by the Committee of One Hundred were not adopted—it is hard to reverse the processes of evolution. There was no deliberate limitation of the total number of students, though they were limited in some departments. In 1919-20 the net enrollment, excluding duplications, for the first time passed 10,000; in 1920-21 it was 11,182; two years later it was 13,577. The peak was in 1927-28, when the net registration rose to 16,382. The depression years showed a gradual decline, but by 1938-39 the net total had increased to 16,137. No departments or established lines of teaching or research were abandoned. It was impossible to disregard the protests and arguments of business men, who insisted on the value of the extension and extramural courses, and appealed to the principles of Franklin in opposition to the recommendation of the Committee of One Hundred for their elimination. Other activities which had come under criticism showed similar powers of survival. The informal address of Mr. Wickersham at the Boston conference of Associated Clubs of 1928 indicated a much more appreciative attitude toward recent University tendencies than he had held in 1920.

There was no one considerable phase of the University's work that could be abandoned unless a deliberate reversal of its development through half a century were undertaken. Any serious diminution of the numbers of the teaching force proved equally impracticable, even though closer inspection was made of the need of each proposed appointment or promotion. As to reliance on more rigorous economy as a means of avoiding dependence on state support, no one who has had negotiations with the Budget Committee on any question of expenditure is apt to have illusions on that possibility.

VALLEY FORGE

But the ideal of the University as a smaller and more select institution, less subject to restless, progressive influences, reflecting more the country than the city, would not down. It appealed to many minds among the Trustees and in the Faculty, among the alumni and even among the students. It has

been mentioned before as part of the original plan of Franklin described in the *Proposals*, and in a letter written in 1750 to his friend Colden: "It was long doubtful whether the Academy would be fixed in the town or country, but a majority of those from whose generous subscriptions we expected to be able to carry the scheme into execution being strongly for the town it was at last fixed to be there." The question had come up repeatedly since. Now it was to be discussed once more.

The ideal of a relatively small college, located in the country, well away from the interruptions, confusions, and social admixtures of city life, making possible a closer intercourse among the students and with the Faculty, providing more healthy and attractive surroundings and allowing more leisure for reading and conversation, hovered before the eyes of many of the most thoughtful of the alumni as a refined and attractive contrast to the numbers, the mixture, the democratic tone which the University was more and more taking. The smaller colleges of New England, or even those in the vicinity of Philadelphia, or a detached university, like Princeton, seemed to them a better ideal of college life, and they regretted the fact that their own University was not like these. The fact that the Trustees and graduates frequently sent their sons to other universities and colleges, although noted and deplored for a century, was said to be becoming still more customary and to be largely the result of the changes that have been described, so that while the number of students was becoming larger, fewer of them were sons of Pennsylvania of the second or third or fourth generation. This was a source of general discussion and Valley Forge was the answer.

This plan was largely due to the influence of the late William Otto Miller, Comptroller of the University. He found as he was campaigning for funds that many of the College alumni declared themselves dissatisfied with the city location of the University, and gave that as a reason for sending their sons elsewhere and for feeling such a languid interest in its affairs. Mr. Henry N. Woolman, a graduate of the College of the class of 1896, influenced by Miller's statements, proceeded to buy a tract of land, Cressbrook Farm, of 178 acres near Valley Forge,

some twenty miles from the city, and June 21, 1926, offered it as a new site for the University, if the Trustees would agree to transfer to it some considerable part of the institution. The Trustees referred the offer to a committee, but action was slow. The difficulties were obvious. Money must be found for buildings, endowment, and current expenses. Six millions were named by its critics; one million by its friends; lesser sums were declared to be adequate for a beginning. It was realized that the roots of the University ran deep into the soil of its present location and would be hard to draw out. It was evident the whole University could not be transplanted, nor indeed all its undergraduate schools, so the project gradually narrowed till it was conceived of as applying only to the College, then to a branch of the College, then to a select group of students. One committee after another was appointed, reports of progress were made, and in 1930 a Valley Forge Board was created with membership representing the Trustees, Faculty and alumni. But nothing was actually done by the Trustees.

Among the alumni and even on the part of some members of the Faculty there was considerable interest, even enthusiasm for the plan. It was discussed with approval at each conference of the Associated Clubs after 1926. The General Alumni Society appointed a committee and resolutions of urgency were sent to the Board of Trustees, which was felt to be lukewarm. Those who were hopeful of the plan looked forward to the rise of buildings and the usual college dependencies that might make up a small town. This led Mr. Woolman to purchase an adjoining farm, and the joint committee of Trustees, Faculty and alumni even spoke of needing a tract of 1,600 acres to keep the college free from intrusion. Plans were worked out by which it was thought teaching could be done with a minimum of difficulty by the same Faculty as should be teaching in West Philadelphia, or by some of its members.

It was, however, all a dream; every approach to the actual problems of such a transfer disclosed financial and other difficulties beyond practicable settlement. Students and professors of a certain medieval university are said to have migrated in one day and established themselves in a body in another city.

But their problem was an easy one in comparison with Pennsylvania's. They had no libraries to be replaced, no laboratories, no dormitories, no playing field, no heating or lighting—only two or three empty rooms in which the teachers might lecture to students who slept in the slums and attended lectures when they felt like it.

The project of a college at Valley Forge is not abandoned; it may yet materialize. The Bicentennial campaign seeks a fund of something more than half a million dollars which, if subscribed, will provide facilities for the education, under favorable conditions, of a small group of selected students, who may thus be pioneers of a different type of education from that to which the University as a whole is devoted, and toward which its evolution has so far tended. Meanwhile the Trustees have taken the two farms off the hands of the original donor, to whom they had become a burden, and hold them, for the present, awaiting the necessary funds. If those are not forthcoming the property will presumably be devoted to the general uses of the University.

THE PROVOST'S HOUSE

The plan of securing a house in which the Provost should live, entertain official guests of the University and his own, and which might serve as a sort of social center for the University, was another chapter in the story of the desire of many of the alumni that Pennsylvania should do those things that other colleges and universities of her class were doing. The plan was initiated at a "Founders Night" meeting of the Mask and Wig Club, February 14, 1914, and was financed chiefly by a gift from the Club of \$25,000, and by funds raised by the General Alumni Society and the Associated Clubs to the amount of \$104,000. These combined efforts made possible the acquisition of the interesting old house near Forty-first and Pine streets, the remote successor of the first Provost's House at Fourth and Arch streets. The plain tastes of Provost and Mrs. Smith and their disinclination to the régime of entertaining its occupation would have required, reduced it for a few years to

the level of an administrative building. The frequent and hospitable attentions shown to visiting scholars and officials of other universities which marked the administration of Dr. Smith were provided at his own expense in one or another of the city clubs. Ultimately the house was occupied and put to its intended uses by the exercise of a kindly hospitality there by Provost and Mrs. Penniman in the later years of his administration.

THE FUND

It was a frequent criticism of the University during this period, as indeed it was of other institutions of equal intellectual rank, that it was "drifting." This was an inappropriate figure of speech, except as it applied to its financial support. The University was not a captainless ship drifting on the waves; it was rather a tree, unpruned it may be (but who was wise enough to prune it?), growing at the end of every branch, constantly putting out new twigs and shoots from the very exuberance of its life and its freedom from restriction. It was well that this should be so. "To teach the young idea how to shoot" may be the proper task of a schoolmaster, but it is doubtful whether the intellectual life of a university can or should be guided in an established and prearranged groove. Its freedom to grow in any direction, its adaptation to changing conditions, its ability to experiment, are the very best of its characteristics. There are countries where the universities are regulated, but they do not thrive.

The remark of Mr. George W. Wickersham, a prominent alumnus, at the conference of Pennsylvania Clubs held at Boston in 1928 that "the purpose of the University is to try experiments. . . . The progress which has been made by those institutions which rank highest in the educational world . . . by reason of their ready receptivity of new ideas and willingness to put into operation new ideas," might be taken as expressing the highest of the University's educational ideals.

With regard to finances it was different; greater system in providing for the University's support had become absolutely necessary. Gifts, lotteries, income from endowment, state ap-

propriations, students' fees, had been successively relied on as its principal source of income, but they were all inadequate and irregular. The adoption of a better plan was an outcome of the new alumni interest. October 27, 1924, the Board of Trustees authorized the formation of the University of Pennsylvania Fund, an association, principally of alumni, whose object was the concentration under systematic direction of alumni gifts for the support of the University. A general committee was formed and set to work to such good effect that in the first two years of their effort, from the date of the establishment of the Fund to the end of the year 1926, they were able to report subscriptions from more than ten thousand alumni and to turn over to the University treasury more than \$3,000,000. This was the subject of discussion and of expressions of satisfaction at each conference of the Associated Clubs.

The Fund was thereupon made a permanent organization under the authority of the Trustees, consisting of members representing the Trustees, the Faculties, the Administration, and the General Alumni Association. They adopted a plan which had been lately coming to general attention. The "Yale System" of regular contributions from the alumni to the University, founded in 1890, its collections applied partly to current expenses, partly to building up a permanent endowment, had been followed in principle by one institution after another until by 1926 eleven of the larger universities in the country had worked out a more or less consistent plan of regular contributions from their alumni. That year a committee of the University Fund made a careful study of these plans and drew up, on the basis of these, and of their own experience and the peculiar position of Pennsylvania a body of rules and regulations to provide for a system of annual giving. They were reduced to a definite plan, adopted and published September 1930. They provided for a system of annual contributions from alumni as the principal means of securing funds for the University's support. All money-raising efforts on behalf of the University in future were to be carried on by the consent and advice of the General Committee of the Fund. Although its origin and history have connected it especially

with the alumni, and with provision for current needs, it has interested itself also in appealing for outside interest in the University and obtaining aid in the support and growth of the multifarious endowments for special objects. Obtaining subscriptions involved other activities. "To keep in the minds of the public the literary and scientific work, the public service and the financial needs of the University," was to be as much a part of its work as "to secure the interest and support of its graduates and former students, wherever situated, and to endeavor to have their interest and support manifest itself in the form of gifts and contributions to the approved needs of the University."

To achieve this publicity and these financial ends the Fund constructed an administration with a general manager, a managing committee, officers, headquarters, and a staff, paying its expenses from the receipts from its efforts, and carrying on extensive operations almost paralleling the policy-making and educational activities of the University. The annual reports of the Fund have given striking testimony to the excellence of this plan for providing an approach to an adequate support for the University.

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

One of the branches of the University tree that continued to grow, even in an unfriendly atmosphere, was the education of women. The Graduate School for Women of 1892, it is true, had not flourished. It had at best been rather an excuse for inaction than fulfillment of the demand that undoubtedly existed. But either as holders of its scholarships or as ordinary students, women studied in the Department of Philosophy without opposition. Women were admitted to the Law School in 1881, and in 1914 the Medical and Dental schools quietly opened their doors to them.

But there were not many who wanted these professional or graduate courses. The great demand for admission was on the undergraduate level. Many young women, as has been pointed out, sought admission to College to prepare for teaching. It

was mainly for their sake, the Saturday teachers' courses, the College Courses for Teachers, and the Summer School had been established. In 1893 a way had been found for furnishing specialized training for both graduates and undergraduates preparing for the profession of teaching. In that year a chair of pedagogy was established the incumbent of which, for a moderate salary, gave on Friday evenings a graduate lecture and on Saturdays taught an undergraduate class. The first to hold the chair was Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh, appointed in 1895, a man of great energy and competence. He held many interim positions, from Superintendent of Schools of Puerto Rico and of Philadelphia to Governor of Pennsylvania, but managed to carry on at intervals for ten years pedagogical courses of much influence. He was succeeded by A. D. Yocom. Women and men alike came trooping to these educational classes, to the graduate classes if they had been to college, to the Saturday classes if they were still undergraduates or working school teachers.

It was in these classes that Professor Witmer gave the earliest courses in child psychology given in this country and laid the bases of his Psychological Clinic, and from them sociology made its way into the College, the Wharton School, and the Graduate School. It is evident that someone—the Provost or the Trustees, recognized the applicability of the educational courses to existing conditions, for in 1913 two new and strong men were added to the Faculty in this field, each giving both graduate and undergraduate work and each receiving a larger salary than the average paid in Pennsylvania at that time. Even this provision of graduate courses and courses for teachers in service was not sufficient to meet the demand. The courses of lectures in pedagogy in the Department of Philosophy were open only to college graduates and were largely historical and philosophical, not providing that professional and technical training that students preparing for teaching were supposed to require. There were on the other hand many young men and women willing to give all their time for four years to prepare for higher positions in teaching to fulfill the new and more rigorous requirements being made by school authorities.

The organization of a separate School of Education seemed

the best way to meet the problem, though it would almost certainly increase the number of women in the University. Such a development was evidently anticipated, for the state appropriation of 1913, the second under Dr. Smith's provostship, included a substantial sum for teacher training. The School of Education, separate from the Graduate School and the College Courses for Teachers, was thereupon organized, and opened its courses in the fall of 1914. It had a separate Dean and Faculty; provided a four-year course and after some hesitation whether to claim the A.B. or not, decided to give the new degree Bachelor of Science in Education.

Professor Frank Pierrepont Graves, the Dean, had had a varied experience as Instructor in Greek at Columbia, President of the University of the State of Washington, and Professor of Pedagogy at Ohio State University. He exerted much influence till, after eight years here, he resigned to become Commissioner of Education of the State of New York. The new school started with a hundred students and increased rapidly in numbers. On the other hand the obvious desirability of a careful selection of students whose personality would be likely to lead to success as teachers induced an early habit of testing each applicant for entrance by a personnel committee or officer.

Although there was no exclusion of men from any of these courses, it was obvious that the School of Education with its great preponderance of women was adding a large number to the feminine contingent in the University. The old barriers were rapidly breaking down. Women had always been members of the Evening and Extension courses. When in 1920 the old Architectural School was extended into a School of Fine Arts, women were admitted to all its courses except that which led directly to professional work in architecture, and in 1934 even this barrier was to a certain extent removed. The School of Veterinary Medicine held out till 1933, though it would seem that the field of the care of small animals was notably one of promise for women. They can be seen busy in their daily attentions to them along the Seine and in thousands of American households.

Constant extension of the dormitories for men, with no

special provision for women, began to seem so anomalous that in 1924 the Trustees bought the apartment house at Thirty-fourth and Chestnut streets as a dormitory for women, already fairly well adapted as it was to the purpose, and renamed it Sergeant Hall. In 1921 the women, with the consent of the Trustees, formed the Bennett Club which soon obtained the use of a house at Thirty-fourth and Walnut streets for recreational purposes.

In the meantime the Bennett funds were piling up, though they were drawn on for expenses of "coeducation as at present carried on," in the words of the bequest, to pay part of the salaries of such professors as taught both men and women. In 1925 the new Bennett Hall was erected chiefly for women's classes and for the administrative offices of the three departments in which women were most largely represented.

The Faculty of the School of Education were not satisfied with its organization. Four years were not enough for its students to follow the cultural courses they wished them to have and in addition to give them their general professional training and the special equipment they needed for their future work. Another difficulty was that, notwithstanding the vocational intimations of its name, many girls entered the School of Education who wanted college life and a college degree but had no expectation of becoming teachers. This made it difficult to arrange a curriculum suited to both cultural and professional needs. Therefore in 1933 the School of Education boldly dropped its two lower classes, added a third year to its upper two and became distinctly a professional school, with technical requirements for graduation that would discourage any student who wished only a cultural college education. This was the long-awaited opportunity to establish a separate college for women. Before describing its foundation, however, some offshoots of the older school must be noted.

The School of Education has been prolific of dependencies, or it may be that it has only served as a magnet to draw them. "Schoolmen's Week" has been, once a year, for a week, usually in April, ever since 1914 an astonishing assembly. It floods, with a horde of mature men and women, Bennett Hall and

any adjacent buildings where rooms for meetings can be found. The first of these annual conferences was held in April 1914, preceding indeed by a few weeks the actual opening of the School of Education itself. The attendants came in response to an invitation issued by the University to superintendents and principals of Pennsylvania public schools, teachers of education in high schools, normal schools, and colleges, and representatives of school boards to meet at the University and confer on such educational topics as might interest them.

The plan was a great success from the beginning; this group of men and women evidently had much to confer upon and were only awaiting the opportunity and the leadership the professors in the Department of Education thus gave them. More than two hundred registered at the first conference and several hundred more attended the meetings. At the second conference almost a thousand registered and more than two thousand attended and so numbers increased at each successive conference until in 1939 there was an attendance of more than five thousand. The invitation itself became inclusive of larger categories. The University, with its traditional hospitality, provided free buffet lunches and suppers to visiting delegates until 1931, when this custom became such a burden and expense that it was suspended. The annual conference has been under the charge of a joint committee of the School of Education and the coöperating schools, but the University has provided, often by a special gift from some sympathizer, for the main expenses of the meeting. The *Proceedings* has been printed as a University document. According to good testimony the discussions, although on questions vital to the school superintendents and teachers, have remained free, open and unbiased,—a good instance of the kind of help the University from its nonpartisan position is able to offer the community.

The latest and one of the most pleasing of the divagations of the School of Education into non-University life, and withal an excellent illustration of the spirit of Mr. Gates's administration is the Cultural Olympics. They were begun in 1936, and as they do not follow the four-year cycle of the great contests from which they are named they have already had a

history of four years. A department of the University which gives no instruction, charges no fees, awards no degrees, and offers only the services of a Director and the occasional use of some of its rooms, reminds one of those early loans of its facilities to artistic and literary organizations, when the University in its second home still had at its disposal the rooms of its first, but in the proportions of the twentieth century. Whatever may have been the size of "Mr. Adgate's music classes" or of the "Humane Society" or of Noah Webster's lecture audiences in the eighteenth century, the Cultural Olympics in 1939 drew to the campus something over eighty thousand visitors, brought together eight thousand participants in its contests in music, dance, speech, and the drama, and in its exhibitions of graphic and plastic arts, from 214 neighboring schools and similar institutions.

Everybody is interested, more or less, in athletic contests, but only a few can participate in them. Why should not young people, very young people, below college age, whose gifts, interests, or ambitions lie in other than athletic directions not enjoy the thrill of competition and obtain the advantages of developing high standards in their own lines? This analogy is at the basis of the Cultural Olympics. The original idea of a Philadelphia philanthropist, the generosity of a Philadelphia retail business organization, the quick favorable response by President Gates to the suggestion of their connection with the University, and the work as Director of a professor in the School of Education, brought into existence this annual series of intellectual and artistic contests among teams from schools in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, with "adjudications" by competent volunteer judges on the excellence of performance in the schools and the finals. If, as suggested in another connection, any one doubts the influence of this modest contribution to the artistic and cultural life of the community, or the reality of its connection with the University, let him attend one of its "shows"—there will be no charge for admission.

One more department was attached to the School of Education. At a certain period in the history of the University there

was much complaint of the extreme youthfulness of the students. In this attachment to the University there can be no question of the proper age limit, for its name establishes its position in the educational scale: the Illman-Carter Unit for Kindergarten and Primary Teachers. However the analogy is spoiled by the fact that it is the teachers, not the children, who are taught in this branch of the School of Education; though as a matter of fact it keeps up a kindergarten and primary school a few blocks from the University as a demonstration or practice school, practically a laboratory.

The absorption by the University of this old and successful school for kindergartners, under the name the department now bears, took place by a vote of the Trustees July 1, 1936. Miss Illman is still Director of the School. Students are enrolled for a four-year course, obtaining their technical training and observation in special courses, and take general culture courses in such other departments as are open to women. Graduates receive the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education.

The adaptation of divisions of the School of Education to useful service in the higher ranges of public education has during this expansive period led to the extension of the Department into many new corners of that field of American life. Some of these extensions have come in by the offer of financial aid from the outside, such as the courses in Vocational Education, some from professional urgency, such as the Department of Nursing Education. Almost the only unity among them and the only limitation on indefinite subdivision is the requirement that all students shall take courses appropriate to receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and shall be given the opportunity by prolonged study to receive the degree of Master of Science in Education. The decision of Dean Graves when the school was organized in 1914 not to ask for the purely cultural degree of A.B. but to award the technical scientific degree instead was a pregnant one. It held in it not only the avoidance of the jealousy of those who wished to preserve the purely cultural significance of the older degree, but it offered the extension of the degree of B.S. in Ed. to all

the numerous ramifications of the profession of education in these later years. There are few departments of the University more clearly adapted to the growing needs of the community.

In the same general field of the training of young people, though not along the usual educational lines, was the William T. Carter Foundation of Child Helping, established in the University in 1924. It was an effort to spread, through academic means, the experiences of the donor and her husband in carrying on for many years a school for training troublesome boys; to discover by research the principles on which children could be most effectively helped; and to disseminate through lectures and other means such devices for that purpose as were already known. The Foundation is attached not to the School of Education but to the Department of Sociology; one of the professors in that Department being Director of the Foundation.

THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS FOR WOMEN

The idea of a college for women exactly paralleling the old College had slept peacefully for half a century, except for an occasional disturbing dream of official mention, such as successive Provosts had introduced from time to time into their annual reports on the needs of the University, or as the alumni had grasped at it as an alternative to coeducation, or as it was announced as one of the objects of the University Fund in 1925. In the meantime the pressure of women students desiring to obtain a general college education and able to do so only by the tortuous process of selecting courses not intended for that purpose—the College Courses for Teachers, the School of Education, the School of Fine Arts, or the Biological Department—was becoming greater and greater. The final push came from the adoption by the School of Education of a professional policy of admitting students only to its junior, senior, and post-senior years.

To fill this void of a general course in the earlier years preparatory to the School of Education and to satisfy the wishes of students wanting a general college course, in 1933, just fifty-

one years after the offer of 1882, the College of Liberal Arts for Women was established, with its own Dean and Faculty, although, it must be confessed, without the endowment that had so long been sought, and with a Faculty and courses drawn largely from those already in one or another department. More than five hundred women students attending in its fifth year, however, attest its fulfillment of the need that had long been asserted; and the old hope of an endowment that may enable these young women to enjoy the academic life that normally belongs to one-half the youthful race may still be fulfilled.

To an alumnus returning to the University or examining its statistics there are few more surprising discoveries than the present position of women in the University. There are more women students at Pennsylvania than in any one of the principal women's colleges in the United States. About one-quarter of the students on its rolls are women. This is true whether the total number, something over seventeen thousand enrolled as students of the University in any sense in 1939-40 be taken, of whom five thousand are women; or whether students in the stricter sense of those regularly in residence and candidates for a degree be counted. These number some eight thousand four hundred, of whom nearly two thousand are women. Women are admitted to fifteen departments in the University; and there is more than one course to which women alone are admitted. They have their own dormitories, their own fraternities, their own athletic, scholastic, and other organizations, and their own social life, in addition to the dramatic, musical, and other interests in which men and women share.

And yet Pennsylvania does not impress one as a coeducational institution, nor is it such. Women are still in the University as it were on sufferance. The College, the oldest and most characteristic part of the University, that which is best known to the public and which largely gives tone to the whole institution, is still strictly masculine. Nor does the Wharton School or either of the engineering courses as yet admit women. The infiltration of the feminine element has been gradual; it is not yet complete.

RESEARCH

At his first meeting as Provost with the Board of Trustees, in 1923, Dr. Penniman called their attention to the double position of the University, as a teaching institution and as an institution engaged in the increase of knowledge—to its two functions, teaching and research—to the importance of the latter and to the desirability that it should deliberately acknowledge this as its principal function. It was a significant observation, furnishing a clue to a change of emphasis in the University's interests that has become continually more pronounced.

Research at the University was of course not new. There had always been professors interested in the discovery of new knowledge in their respective fields, and occasionally a student. Research had in some departments been acknowledged and encouraged. Postgraduate study almost necessarily consists largely of investigation, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences became, after its foundation in 1884, so far at least as the work of its teachers and of its candidates for the degree of Ph.D. were concerned, more and more a school of research.

The Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Research, opened in 1895, was the first of a long series of foundations devoted to medical research. Ten years later were established the John Herr Musser Department of Research Medicine and the Department of Surgical Research. The new men who came in with the reorganization of the Medical School Faculty in 1910 were all research men, as were their successors. The Henry Phipps Institute for the Study of Tuberculosis, established in 1903 and handed over to the University in 1910, was to a very large degree a research institution. The last year of work in the Graduate School of Medicine, organized under Dr. George H. Meeker in 1919, was regularly devoted to some piece of research. Later endowments and foundations in the field of medicine have been almost invariably for research in one field or another.

In the meantime, while research was spreading through the whole field of medical study, in other fields it was invading

take aside and suggest that they give up the dream of going into the theatre. "Get yourself a job," she told them. "Make the theatre your pleasure, not a place to work. If this seems hard now, believe me, it is a lot less hard than a long, futile struggle ending in disappointment."

A few weeks before Christmas, the university trustees and faculty gave a Sunday night reception "to welcome Miss Gertrude Lawrence as Professor." Seldom had Gertrude been more flattered about anything. She made her list of special guests with extreme care. As was always her way, she was particular that those who loved her most should be invited. She also let the women among them know that she expected them to do her proud that evening.

She herself went to Hattie Carnegie and ordered a new evening dress. Radie Harris, who had planned to leave for Hollywood, yielded to Gertrude's request and put off her departure in order to attend the reception. Obedient to a not-too-veiled hint from Gertrude, she too went out and bought a gown for the occasion.

Before the reception, there was to be a performance, supervised by Gertrude, of *A Comedy of Errors* by the drama students. No first night of her own had ever been attended with such breathless expectancy on her part.

She had Hazel come to the house to dress her. At Hazel's knock on my door, and her message: "Miss L says, come and see how she looks," I followed her into Gertrude's room. Gertrude turned from the mirror and came a few steps toward me.

"Well, Richard, will I do?"

Poised there, in her long, shimmering gold gown, she was as radiant, as beautiful, and as suggestive of imperishable romance as she had been on that Sunday morning on which our decisive trip to Northfield began. Eleven years had passed since then, but she was still the most desirable and exciting woman in the world.

I told her so. More lights seemed to shine in her eyes.

"Then you're pleased with me, darling?"

With Hazel busying herself about the room I found it difficult to say how very pleased I was. I took refuge in pleasantries. "No one," I told her, "would ever take you for a school teacher."

War. The necessity of a search for raw materials, food supplies, chemical, and all other requirements in war time was stimulated by the events of 1917 and 1918 and led to the creation by the government of the National Research Council and the revival of the National Academy of Sciences for the study of our national resources. There was also a proposal, emanating from Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, for a vast national research endowment for continued investigations. At the same time industrial concerns were setting up at their own expense those research laboratories which have played such a brilliant part in modern scientific invention and production.

In this movement the universities had as yet no recognized part, although the laboratories and the endowed projects of research were necessarily manned almost entirely by men trained in the universities. This was a matter of remark among many university men. Impressed with the importance of this function of the University, as already indicated, Provost Penniman in the spring of 1926 issued an invitation to a large number of men connected with endowments for research, government departments, industrial establishments, and the universities to attend at the University a conference on the part which universities should take in this growing activity. The conference met May 3, 1926. It included seven representatives of the large foundations, the heads of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and the General Electric Company, and twelve university men and engineers. They held a morning and an afternoon session and adopted resolutions approving the national endowment for research being advocated under Mr. Hoover, and a "self-analysis" by each of the larger universities to consider what should be its relation to research. These inquiries, made along lines suggested by Dr. Merriam, head of the Carnegie Institution, were supposed to bring out the need and opportunity for a research policy at each institution, its means of support, and its probable success in coördinating its work with that of other research bodies.

The results were only moderately satisfactory. The national endowment fund ran on the rocks of the economic catastrophe

that so soon followed; the foundations gave grants for research freely, but took little interest in the university problem. Several universities, especially the state universities, had such large amounts available for research, like California with its \$80,000 a year, and so completely under their own control, that they were tempted to neglect any attempt at a general policy.

At Pennsylvania the matter was taken up more seriously. The Provost appointed a committee which held many meetings in 1929 and 1930 under Dr. McClung as chairman and presented a carefully drawn-up report to the Provost which he transmitted to the Trustees May 23, 1930. Of the recommendations of this committee only two were put into effect at the time, though the others have remained under consideration and some, not directly connected with research, have since been accepted. The two recommendations adopted in 1930 were, first, that the Graduate School and all systematic research being done at the University should be placed under the charge of a special group of the Trustees, and, second, that a standing Faculty Research Committee be appointed provided with a substantial sum yearly for giving assistance to members of the Faculty desirous of carrying out research projects. It was to be their duty also to encourage all forms of research at the University. A Faculty Research Committee was thereupon appointed and a grant of \$80,000 obtained from the Rockefeller Foundation, December 1930, to be spread over six years, for assistance to research projects.

The new Board of Graduate Education and Research of the Trustees in January 1931 gave its instructions to the Faculty Committee, which held its first meeting March 20, 1931. Since that time it has functioned, meeting with regularity, reporting monthly to the Trustee Board and showing much activity. After a year and a half it was able to report that it had made something over a hundred grants to approximately the same number of applicants, in thirty-two departments. The objects were naturally of great variety; the grants were mostly small, averaging \$135 apiece. There was universal testimony to their great helpfulness.

The work of the Research Committee and the interest of

the Board of Graduate Education and Research have continued since along nearly the same lines, though much restricted by lack of means. The Trustees have recognized the importance of this work by making appropriations, not of course as large as could be expended to advantage, but generous in view of the difficult period. Apart from actual assistance given to members of the Faculty in carrying out projects which they could not have completed otherwise, this official recognition and aid have quite transformed the general attitude toward research. Every member of the Faculty is not a productive scholar, nor is it necessary or perhaps desirable that he should be, though generally speaking, a teacher in a college or a university is not apt to continue useful unless he has some individual creative interest. But research is universally respected if not actually performed. One result of this appreciation is that in all new appointments or promotions the Dean of the Graduate School is consulted to make sure the interests of research are considered. There will in future be less dead wood. The University now stands reasonably well, notwithstanding its lack of endowments in all other fields than medicine, in comparison with other institutions in the amount and quality of research being carried on by its men.

Chapter 10

UNDER A PRESIDENT

1930-1940

As the second century of the University's history drew toward a close it became increasingly evident that its educational progress during the past fifty years of expansion had been more rapid than the development of its administrative structure. The same distant and unorganized Board of Trustees, the same body of incongruous powers and responsibilities incumbent on the Provost, the same absence of centralized and coördinated administrative offices characterized the large and complex institution of 1900 to 1930 that had been true of the smaller and simpler institution of the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The correction of this state of affairs, the process of bringing administration up to the level of education and research, had begun in the midst of the discussions of policy and finance described above. Much of it occurred therefore earlier than the date placed at the head of this chapter; it began indeed as early as 1917 or 1919, but its culmination came later and it can be better discussed now when it has been completed. It began with a strengthening of the executive offices. More careful selection of persons, better salaries, additions to their powers, provision of better offices and equipment made such officers as the Secretary of the University, the Comptroller, the Treasurer, as conspicuous in their domain as educational officers of corresponding rank were in theirs. The statutes say, somewhat later, of the Treasurer, the Secretary, the Comptroller, the General Counsel and the Librarian, in each case, "He shall have the academic rank of Professor." Lesser offices were created, a purchasing

agent, a superintendent of buildings and grounds, an office manager, a publicity manager. The University was growing up, in its own way, along the lines of big business. When Provost Smith for personal reasons declined in 1919 to live in the newly acquired Provost's House, a group of officials and their clerks established headquarters there until Provost Penniman took up his residence there in 1923.

About the same time a group of additional activities were undertaken by the University. The impressive catalogue of alumni gathered in the Fund campaign in 1925 was handed over to the University and became the permanent Alumni Records Office. The Placement Service was established in 1926 to bring students and graduates and the positions they hoped were waiting for them together. In 1920 a University Press had been incorporated largely for printing official publications. In 1927, when a professional editor and manager, Mr. Phelps Soule, formerly of the Yale University Press, was appointed, it became the regular publishing department of the University under the charge of a committee drawn from the Faculties with the Secretary a member *ex officio*.

In 1926, as before observed, the title of President was abandoned or rather, in the words of the Trustees' resolution, "changed to Provost," so that Dr. Penniman, who had been for three years both President and Provost now resumed the traditional title alone. At the same time a more important administrative change was made. In place of the old single Vice-Provost, who was simply one of the professors, with few or no distinctive duties except in the disability of the Provost, there were created three Vice-Provosts, one responsible for Faculty personnel and relations, one in charge of student government and welfare, and one in charge of public relations. To the last-named post was elected Mr. George A. Brakeley, later unfortunately lost by us to Princeton, his alma mater. Dr. George W. McClelland, already Vice-Provost, was continued in charge of faculty personnel, and for a time the third department, student welfare, also remained in his charge.

By further amendment in 1928 the jurisdictions of the Vice-Provostships were more sharply defined. The title of the first,

that of Dr. McClelland, became Vice-Provost in Charge of Undergraduate Departments, Mr. Brakeley became Vice-Provost in Charge of Administration, and a new jurisdiction, that of Vice-Provost in Charge of Medical Departments, was set up. This post, perhaps the most difficult and certainly the most conspicuous, remained unfilled for three years. It would involve the duty of coördinating and developing what was already a great group of schools, hospitals, and research institutes, destined to become still more extensive and complicated by the endowments and mergers of the next few years. The constructive work of Dr. Alfred Stengel who was placed in this position in 1931 made his sudden death in 1939 a real calamity. The University was most fortunate in having Dr. Alfred Newton Richards to put in his place.

Further development of the vice-provostships, now called vice-presidencies, came in January 1931, when a complete revision of the statutes provided, among other things, that the Provost should remain in charge of the Graduate School, the Libraries, and Research, and that Undergraduate Schools, Medical Affairs, the Law School, and Administration should each be in charge of a Vice-President. In 1939, with the retirement of Dr. Penniman and the election of Dr. McClelland as Provost, the jurisdiction of the latter office was extended over Undergraduate Affairs and that Vice-Presidency disappeared. At the same time a new office was created, that of Vice-President, Assistant to the President. These departmental vice-presidencies were an original and fortunate invention, forming an effective link between administration, teaching, and research.

The need for greater efficiency in carrying on the administration of the University and the wish to respond favorably to the repeated requests of the alumni for larger representation on the Board of Trustees combined to make some reorganization of the Board itself desirable. Notwithstanding its more active membership in recent times, it was cumbrous and unresponsive to the needs of the time. It was either too large or too small; too large for unity and for combined responsibility, too small to furnish informed committees on all the many fields of interest now covered by the University's activities. It was also

widely felt that the Board should be made more representative of all classes in the community. To reach these ends the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia in December 1927, upon application, modified the charter of the University by increasing the number of the Trustees from twenty-four to forty-one, including the Governor, *ex-officio*, and permitting the Trustees by statute to establish a new class of Trustees, serving for a term of ten years, instead of for life. The new statutes, adopted in 1928, provided for ten Life Trustees, twenty Term Trustees, and ten to be elected for terms of ten years by the alumni and known as Alumni Trustees, thus conceding their old demand.

In the statutes of 1928 the reinforced Board of Trustees introduced a still more significant change, the system of constituent boards. It was largely that this might be done that the board had been increased in numbers and flexibility. Each of the eight principal fields of University interest was placed under the administration of a group of these Trustees. These boards, each in its own field, had much the power of the whole Board of Trustees, including appointments, the awarding of degrees, the approval of curricula; with new powers and duties, to be drawn, it was hoped, from their increased interest in and knowledge of the conditions in the particular department which was under their control. Thus there was formed a Constituent Board for Graduate Education and Research, having jurisdiction over the Graduate School, the Libraries, and research work wherever it was being done in the University; a Board of Liberal Arts, having jurisdiction over the College of Arts and Sciences, the College Courses for Teachers, the Towne School, and the general extension courses; and so with the Fine Arts, Medical Affairs, Business Education, Law, Teacher Training, and Engineering boards.

The Provost and respective Vice-Presidents are members *ex officio* of their appropriate constituent boards. Heads of teaching departments and other professors are regularly called into consultation. Each board has the right to elect yearly Associate Trustees, heads of neighboring colleges and other interested outsiders, and in many cases these have attended the monthly meetings of the boards, taken part in their discussions and

added much that was of value and interest. These constituent boards have proved to be as effective and helpful as they were original. A small group of four or five Trustees acting with all or almost all the power of the whole Board, with a Provost or Vice-President and in many cases Associate Trustees familiar with and interested in some phase of the University's work, have given guidance and encouragement to members of the Faculty and in turn have been themselves brought into contact with its problems to a degree unknown before in the University's history. An element of coöperation with other institutions has already emerged, almost involuntarily, from these board meetings that is of the greatest interest and promise. But the stage is even yet scarcely set for the drama of institutional coöperation that may yet some day be played.

The first stages of these administrative changes were made between 1925 and 1929 while the highest officer of the University was still the Provost. One might speculate whether this reorganization should not include a change of the system at the top. The powers and responsibilities of the Provost had been growing in number and complexity ever since the accession of Provost Pepper to office—or at least until the Fund had recently taken part of the financial burden from him. Few people realize the problems, external and internal, financial and personal, arising in the work of an educational institution with some fifteen hundred instructors and more than as many thousand students, distributed in some forty semi-independent schools, departments, institutes, and foundations, and expending an annual budget (in 1939-40) of well over eight millions; an institution full of life, constantly growing, demanding financial support, keeping up old standards and at the same time adapting itself to the mold of its time. These requirements for the old office of Provost had become more than any one man could be expected to fulfill. They were also more heterogeneous in character, as the University touched the community at more points.

The University was fortunate in being able, without too great a wrench with the past, and without disparagement of its long line of Provosts, to satisfy this demand for new qualifica-

tions for headship. Provost Penniman, who was in office during this period of reorganization, was a man of long experience in University administration, had solved many problems and placated many conflicts. He had presided over its affairs with dignity and charm for many years. His was the pen of a ready writer, and he had spoken judiciously on a great variety of occasions to thousands of University men and women and to other thousands of outsiders concerning the University. As host at the Provost's House and as presiding officer at the Board of Trustees and at Faculty meetings and in intercourse with the outside world, he was a Provost whom all could respect and admire. But he was primarily a scholar, by preference a man of contemplation rather than of action, with no bent toward finance and no more experience in solving its problems than his share in seeking the day-by-day support the University demanded.

There was available for higher University service at this time a man with a different group of qualifications. Thomas S. Gates was a graduate of the Wharton School of the class of '93, and of the Law School of '96: he had also carried on post-graduate work. He had practised law for some years; then, in business and banking connections, he had achieved a notable success. He was a director of the Pennsylvania Railroad and member of many other boards. He had been an interested and prominent alumnus almost from his graduation. He had been a member of the Committee of One Hundred and had taken part, though not a prominent part, in the discussions of the alumni concerning University policy in 1920. He was a member of the various committees on Valley Forge. He had been elected a Trustee in 1921 and was chairman of the Board of Managers of the Fund in 1925 and subsequently. He was made chairman of the Executive Board of the Trustees in 1929. He was already something of a civic leader, being one of the supporters of the Philadelphia Orchestra and of the Academy of Fine Arts. His choice for the Philadelphia Award, with universal acclaim, was still to come. He was a man of literary interests and culture, and sympathetic with all intellectual interests. Above all he was ready and willing to retire from business and

to give himself with devotion to the service of the University.

In the clamorous need of the University administration for executive ability and business training, the fortunate chance to obtain these, combined with understanding of and sympathy with its intellectual needs and ambitions, offered an opportunity that could not be wasted. The Trustees therefore, October 6, 1930, passed an amendment to the statutes providing that "the Trustees discharge all their executive duties through an officer who shall be styled President of the University." Mr. Gates was thereupon elected President October 8, 1930. It was a great change in few words; it was followed by a complete revision of the statutes made in January 1931 embodying this new office and all the administrative changes that have now been described. The arrangement for ten Life Trustees and twenty Term Trustees, with ten Trustees to be elected by the alumni, was made permanent. The President became the head of the University. All officers, instructors, and employees were made responsible to him, and he became presiding officer of the Board of Trustees, except for the nominal *ex officio* presidency of the Governor of the state, reserved by charter. He was given all other powers usually belonging to the head of a university or other corporate body, defined by a carefully formulated body of statutes. The University was at last under a President.

There was an obvious attempt to preserve to the provostship as much of its old prominence as possible under a more highly centralized régime than had ever before existed. The Provost was described in the statutes as "the senior educational officer of the University," and, since the University is an educational institution, this left him a wide sphere of honors and duties; membership in all Faculties, the right of attendance at meetings of the Trustees, of the Executive Council, of all constituent boards and of the Administrative Council, and the chairmanship of the Educational Council. In other respects the position of Provost was similar to that of one, though the highest one, of the Vice-Presidents, as the former Vice-Provosts were now called. He had special oversight of the Graduate School of Arts and Science and of the Library. In the words of the statute, he

was also "responsible for the coördination of the research work in all schools and departments," one of the activities of the University in which, as already mentioned, Provost Penniman was especially interested, and which was rapidly becoming one of its chief functions. He must also advise the President on his educational policies and on the general development of the University.

During the remaining eight years of Provost Penniman's service, until his retirement in June 1939, he found no lack of occupation, responsibility, and recognition. Many of his predecessors in office, if they could have looked forward to these halcyon days of relief of the provostship from so many of its financial and administrative burdens, would have anticipated his position with profound envy. Few who were present will forget the distinguished occasion in June 1939 on which his retirement was celebrated. His successor as Provost, Dr. George W. McClelland, elected in 1939, had been so long Vice-President in charge of Undergraduate Schools that this Department, as has been seen, was added to the fields of which the Provost had special oversight and to his more general duties. Provost McClelland's administration is not yet a matter of history, and it remains to be seen just what development the provostship will go through under the presidency; but, whatever shape it may take, around the title will always cling some of its old traditions.

These paragraphs may seem a somewhat technical description of formal changes in the administrative framework of the University. Justification for them is to be found in the fact that this reorganization is in a certain sense the culmination of the administrative history of the past and a well-devised foundation for the future. The Administration, the Faculties, the alumni, even the students, each have now a position in the whole organization with which they feel satisfied and in which they can act efficiently. In regard to the students there is a curious fact to be noted—that the old problem of discipline has almost vanished. Misbehavior in the classroom or about the buildings is nearly unknown. The reason is a matter of speculation: the presence of women, the greater interest of studies, the outlet of athletics, the interest in outside social questions, the multi-

plicity of extra-curricular interests, better teaching—all have been suggested as explanations of the fact that the childishness and trouble-making that played so large a part in college life in earlier days no longer exists in these. At the same time the touch-me-not attitude of the members of the Faculty of former generations in their relations with students, the old-fashioned insistence on the outward shows of respect, and the demand for unbroken attention and implicit obedience—demanded but seldom or never obtained—seem somewhat absurd to their successors. Perhaps it is because there are so many teachers and students that formality is less and behavior better.

Few administrators with a difficult financial problem to solve have entered office in more unpromising times than those in which Mr. Gates took up his duties as President in October 1930. It was in the early days of the depression. The University was subject to the same storms as were breaking on other institutions. It suffered many harsh effects: reduced appropriations for books and research, restriction on what seemed necessary purchases and expenditures, painfully rigid economies, a slowing down of the normal course of appointments and promotions. But the University had reason to be grateful for the leadership of its new President in weathering the storm. Salaries were cut down only moderately and for the most part soon restored. There was no catastrophic loss or failure anywhere in the institution. It was no light matter that scholarship was still safe though suffering under the chastening hand of extreme frugality; that while the budget was being balanced the Faculties and lecture courses and publications of the University remained so nearly intact. Mr. Gates was himself a financier and doubtless took the best financial advice; but he was also an educator and took counsel of those who were interested in keeping learning and teaching alive for a better day at any price.

Rifts in the clouds began to appear, apprehension for the future to pass away and progress along normal lines to be resumed. Some financial reforms were of a general and permanent character. Mortgages that burdened many departments were brought into one with a considerable saving of interest; trusts

were consolidated and made more productive; investments were improved and made more secure. It was claimed that few if any such institutions had on the whole a better percentage of income from their investments. It is only a pity there were not more of them. In these improvements the late F. Corlies Morgan, Treasurer of the University from 1919 to his sudden death in 1939, played an important part, and his vision and sound judgment were also felt in many other fields of University administration.

Some financial advantages arose as the result of reforms entered upon primarily for other reasons. This was true of the so-called "Gates Plan." The Gates Plan was approved by the Trustees February 2, 1931, following a report which had been prepared after a four-month study by Gordon Hardwick and Michael Dorizas, interested alumni, and was presented to the Board by President Gates with a recommendation for its adoption. This resolution set up the Department of Physical Education, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Student Health. It was to have a Dean and group of professors, assistant professors, and instructors making up a faculty. Rules and requirements were assimilated to those of other departments of the University. This combination of formerly independent activities presented several new provisions. In the first place, physical education and competitive athletics were placed under one head. The unity of these two objectives, physical training and athletic competition, long claimed and occasionally even striven for but never realized, was now measurably attained. The first incumbent of the responsible position of Dean was Dr. E. Leroy Mercer, who introduced into the Department a régime of efficiency and strict control.

Secondly, intercollegiate athletics, heretofore practically under alumni management, became a budgeted department of the University, under the financial supervision of the Treasurer and Comptroller. Coaches became members of the University Faculty. The more careful supervision of finances in this field has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars in the years the plan has been in operation. More important than the finances, however, was the larger share of the students in the control of

athletics and greater participation in them. Not only were professionalism and doubtful practices in football and some other sports eliminated or much diminished, but the number of students taking active part in competitive games and in ordinary outdoor exercises was much increased. It was part of the Gates Plan to encourage a much greater variety and number of athletic contests, to introduce much more intramural competition, and above all to root out and make impossible all dishonesty in athletics. Whether these changes have been favorable or unfavorable to success in intercollegiate contests is a moot point; several factors enter into that problem, but criticism has been disarmed and scandal put an end to. The new Sydney E. Hutchinson Gymnasium and the Palestra, the home of basket ball and other indoor contests, were opened in 1927, and the group of tennis courts, soccer fields and the new field house, with their facilities for women, made the River Fields an additional center for athletic activities. This equipment, along with the spirit of the reformed system, has brought many score more students to share in athletic activities.

Thirdly, in the field of student health, an advisory board was set up to coördinate this department with medical and hospital facilities. A health fee of \$10 a year was charged to all regular students; in return for which an infirmary was established in which, in case of indisposition, students were kept if necessary for three days without special charge; further hospitalization being in the students' ward of the University Hospital at a moderate cost, or elsewhere at the option of the student's physician. There was an annual physical examination, special examinations as required, and expert advice. A staff of physicians and nurses were made available for this student health service. The results of this supervision asserted themselves immediately; thousands of physical, x-ray, and laboratory examinations, and literally tens of thousands of visits by students to dispensaries within a year brought about a remarkable régime of health and physical well-being.

To list the most recent occurrences at the University, those which belong especially to the period of the administration of Mr. Gates, as has been done for other administrations, is very

difficult. It is much like counting chips as they drift by on a running stream; they appear so suddenly and give so little time for observation. To measure the special influence on the course of events exercised by the present head of the University, as has been done for other administrations, presents still greater difficulties. The last ten years of time should belong not to the historian but to the commentator.

However, the interest of some recent movements forbids their neglect. There is scarcely one of those lines of development that have been traced in the past that has not continued down through recent years. Most of them must be abandoned here; only a few can be mentioned before the past is left entirely to itself. New schools have continued to be established. The School of Liberal Arts for Women has already been described. The School of Fine Arts arose in 1920 from the old Department of Architecture which since 1912 had been part of the Towne School and was then celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of its actual foundation. It had been remarkably successful, and under the influence of the reorganization and combination characteristic of the period proceeded to absorb the old Department of Music, to add courses in the congenial field of landscape architecture, and to draw together the cultural courses on the history and appreciation of art. It included with them professional work in interior decoration. As has been remarked, women were admitted to the fine arts courses after 1923 and to a limited number of the architectural courses after 1935.

The Moore School of Electrical Engineering arose, like the School of Fine Arts, from an older department; this too was an offshoot from the Towne Scientific School. It owed its separateness and distinction to a bequest of approximately a million and a half dollars from Alfred Fitler Moore, a Philadelphia manufacturer, given in memory of his parents and accepted by the University in 1923. The school was able in 1926 to secure "ready made" a building whose location on what thus became one corner of the campus, whose similarity of design to the nearest University buildings, and whose adaptability to its new uses were so remarkable as to suggest either a favoring provi-

dence or anticipation by those who had originally erected it that it would some time fall to the University, which was so steadily taking possession of that part of the city. The Moore School, under the guiding hand of Dean Pender, soon developed graduate as well as undergraduate work in all branches of that rapidly extending field, and since 1928 has given graduate courses in the evening to working and professional engineers.

A characteristic combination of the needs of the time and the readiness of the University to respond to them was the foundation in 1937, on the basis of a six-year trial endowment of \$240,000, the gift of an anonymous donor, of the Institute of Local and State Government. Schools of diplomacy and of national service of various kinds have been established at various places, but it was realized by the donor and his advisers that the problems of state and city, county and township, borough and commission for public service, were none the less pressing and difficult. Democracy begins at home. To fulfill the functions of training career men in this field of public employment, of giving such assistance in the performance of local governmental tasks as its technical equipment might enable it to contribute, and the endless task of research in one more phase of human activity, the Institute was organized, a Director and staff appointed and it set out on its career of experiment and development. It was attached to the Wharton School, provided with an executive board, and, like all other divisions of the University since 1928, placed under an appropriate constituent board of the Trustees, in this case the Board of Business Education. Its short three years of life have done little more than point out its possible fields of activity, but there has been time enough to show that this is a wide one and that it is quite time its cultivation was begun. The fact that President Gates was drafted to act as chairman of the Philadelphia Advisory Finance Commission seems to justify the undertaking by the University of instruction and research in the vast and growing field of which this is a type. A chance activity of the Institute is its coöperation in some of its work with the Pennsylvania State College, reminiscent of the old days of 1864 when it was un-

certain which institution would receive the endowment on which the latter has since been built up, and of 1920 when the Finegan Plan would have drawn the two institutions closer together.

The most recent of the departments to take its place as a separate school is the School of Animal Pathology, so separated in distance and in its field of interest and so recent a recruit that its situation in the University organization still remains something of a question, though it will soon doubtless become much more significant. It was established in May 1937 on Bolton Farm, a well-stocked farm of four hundred acres in Bucks County. It was the gift of the heirs of the Trustee, Effingham B. Morris, who had some years before presented to the Wistar Institute, in which he was much interested, another farm on which the Institute had established laboratories for raising and studying white rats, opossums, frogs, and other forms of life which are regular subjects of biological study. The two farms are adjacent; the more recent acquisition will be devoted to the study of diseases of wild and domestic animals, rather than of their normal condition. For this purpose the state has recently made somewhat liberal appropriations. It was the joint appeal of these new facilities to the three departments, Medicine, Biology, and Veterinary Medicine, that led to the formation of a new school.

Thus old departments have put forth new branches and some entirely new schools have been established; but the most characteristic form of extension in recent times has been combination between the University and other institutions already existing. These combinations have ranged all the way from mere agreed-upon coöperation to affiliation or actual amalgamation. Coöperation has never been a strong point in Philadelphia. Repeated approaches have been made toward the attainment of unity among her cultural institutions, only to be blocked by her ingrained individualism. There are still in Philadelphia almost a dozen public or endowed libraries, with no unifying bond among them, unless the Community Library planned by the University and housing the Union Catalogue already in existence, should provide that bond. It is the same

with other literary, scientific, and artistic institutions. Even Provost Pepper with all his persuasiveness had failed in his dream of making West Philadelphia a university city by inducing the scientific institutions for which Philadelphia is famous to settle themselves there and pool their libraries, collections, and activities. After the University had obtained its third extensive grant of land from the city, he said he hoped that such a "liberal and wise policy on the part of the University will make it more and more clearly recognized as the intellectual center of this great community, around which will naturally group themselves the various scientific and literary institutions whose work is an essential part of the comprehensive University scheme." In March 1889 he extended an invitation to the Academy of Natural Sciences, to settle on this University land, but after some consideration the Academy rather brusquely declined, and the plan of concentration was dropped.

Mr. Gates was more successful, though by a different kind of coöperation. By his influence the Academy now offered to University students in the Earth Sciences both elementary and advanced courses in palaeontology and advanced courses in geology and mineralogy. In 1935 an affiliation was established in quite another field. This was with the Pennsylvania School of Social Work. That organization, although remaining a separate corporation with its own location and its own means of support, becomes, so far as its teaching is concerned, a graduate professional school, and certain members of its faculty become members of the Faculty of the University.

The most striking form of coöperation, extending in these cases to actual merger, lies in the medical field. The merger of the Medico-Chirurgical College with the University in 1916, which led, as already mentioned, to the formation of the Graduate School of Medicine in 1919, was followed by the similar unions of the Polyclinic, the Diagnostic, and the Howard hospitals. They became under various conditions parts of the University and are grouped in the great establishment, located in an older part of the city, making up the Graduate Hospital of the University, or, more exactly, the Hospital of the Graduate School of Medicine of the University. The campus long ago

transcended the limits of the old Blockley Farm which our supposititious prophet looking across the river in 1870 might well have imagined would give perpetual limits to even its widest growth. The latest of these mergers has been that of the Orthopaedic Hospital and Infirmary for Nervous Diseases, finally consummated in 1939.

Independent additions to the Medical Department were the series of foundations for research which, following the Pepper Clinical Laboratory, have been distributed through recent years: the Eldridge Reeves Johnson Foundation for Research in Medical Physics, the Edward B. Robinette Foundation for Study and Treatment of Circulatory Diseases, the John Herr Musser Department of Research Medicine.

Since Mr. Gates has become President to these have been added the George S. Fox Endowment for Medical Research, established in 1932, and the George L. and Emily McMichael Harrison Foundation, in 1936. The interesting and impressive record of all this extensive endowment and its work in the field of medicine must be left, as has been remarked in connection with medical research and frequently elsewhere, to that history of the Medical Department of the University still to be written by some competent and devoted hand, and, it is to be hoped, at some early period.

It is a curious coincidence that the latest and in some ways the most attractive gift to the University, the lovely Morris Arboretum, should be the fulfillment of so old, so often undertaken and as often abandoned a plan. The possession of laid-out gardens has been an ambition and a delight of men since Theophrastus inherited that of his master Aristotle, or Kublai walled in his in Xanadu, or still earlier, as Bacon says in his essay on Gardens, "When God first made man he put him in a garden." It was just such a garden that the brother and sister, John D. and Lydia T. Morris, had planted for themselves on their estate "Compton," in Chestnut Hill, through almost half a century, between 1888 and 1932. Its avenues and thickets and groups and single specimens of rare trees and bushes contrasted well with the stretches of our own native Pennsylvania trees in their undisturbed settings and the open stretches of the

160-acre estate. It came to the University in 1932, in a bequest which had resulted from the personal suggestion of President Gates. Implicit in the possession of a garden by an educational institution, and in this case required in the endowment with which the bequest was accompanied (though that proved less than had been hoped) were research, experimentation, publication, the giving of public lectures, and distribution of plants.

The old attempt to establish a "botanic garden" in 1807 and the purchase of a tract intended for that use in Montgomery County, not far from the Arboretum, will be remembered, also its abandonment for lack of support. A second more modest attempt was wrecked by the erection of the new buildings on the Ninth Street site in 1829. Later Dr. George B. Wood, as he founded and endowed the Auxiliary School of Medicine, laid out a garden for rare plants on which scientific studies should be carried on, but this was never turned over to the University. Scarcely had the modern Department of Biology been established and its building erected when in 1888 a quarter of an acre, then a whole acre nearby were set apart and by the efforts of Professor Rothrock redeemed for scientific uses from the wilderness which covered that part of the University's West Philadelphia tract. The plan dragged until Professor Macfarlane, whose name still clings to the botanical hall, obtained the interest of Provost Harrison and was made Director of the Botanic Garden. A few acres around the biology building were systematically planted and a variety of trees and shrubs of interest set out. Plants and seeds were exchanged with public gardens in Edinburgh, St. Petersburg, Dublin, Cambridge, and other European cities.

Professor Macfarlane was fortunate in obtaining for some years the services of a skilled English gardener, Charles Pettiford, who later attracted attention by his planting of the Pillings garden in Germantown. But the University garden led a struggling existence. Botanic gardens are expensive to maintain. Kew and the Arnold Arboretum and a few other famous gardens are the survivors of long lists that have been at one time or another established but are now recorded as "discontinued." So when the Morris Arboretum was bequeathed to the

University and with impressive ceremonies, in the midst of beautiful summer weather, with distinguished speakers from Canada and New England, and general festivity handed over on June 2, 1933, to the oversight of the professors of botany in the University, they were given not only an attractive academic home and an interesting task but the fulfillment of an old academic dream.

The writer of history has to select his materials. If what he writes is to be a story, as the etymology of the word seems to indicate, he must include only those things he can work into his narrative. This chronicle, as it is being now brought to its close, has omitted many things that have bulked large in the interest of University men and, in these latter days, women. Athletics have of course asserted themselves in the narrative momentarily now and again. But nothing has been said about the dramatic societies existing at the University, temporarily or for longer periods, from the Thespians of 1867 or the Garrick Club of the nineties or the Mask and Wig Club, which has enlivened the University and the community by its annual plays since its foundation in 1888, or those who have given the French and German plays, or the creators of the shows given by the Architects and the Engineers—down to the highly organized and semi-official Pennsylvania Players of the last five years. Their history has been a long and obscure series of events, difficult to trace and incapable of being worked into this general narrative.

It is the same with another phase of college life, undergraduate journalism. Some forty periodical publications have been started on their more or less extended career: some humorous, like *Chaff* and the *Punch Bowl*; others informative and professional, like the Medical and Dental and Law reviews, or the *Wharton News*, or the *Lantern*; others literary, like the *Junto* and the *Red and Blue*; still others mixed of news and literature, like Philo's *University Magazine* (the mention of whose name still brings editorial worries to the mind of this writer) which in order to provide more news was duly handed over to its successor, the *Pennsylvanian*, in 1885. The history of these ventures would be the record of an interesting part of Uni-

versity life, but it would be only in a very disjointed narrative that it could be combined with the history of dramatics.

The history of music at Pennsylvania has been neglected, at least since colonial times. The many years in which it was represented solely by the Glee Club, the formation in the eighties of the first University orchestra, the union of all the existing musical societies in 1898 into the Combined Musical Clubs, the recent extension and transformation of the students' musical interests and achievements under the guidance of the Faculty of the School of Fine Arts, would make an interesting chronicle if it could be combined with these other forms of University life. Nor will any mention be found here of the introduction of the honor societies that base their membership on scholarship alone, though the earliest and best known of them, Phi Beta Kappa, the Delta chapter of which was established at Pennsylvania in 1892, and Sigma Xi, the corresponding scientific society established in 1899, might well have been included, just as were "Philo" and "Zelo" as literary societies. But after these came, in a long line, some twenty such open societies, representing special departments or special intellectual interests, or, like Sphinx, Friars, and Phi Kappa Beta, choosing their members at large from those about to graduate or to pass on to the next year.

The secret Greek-letter societies have been omitted with regret. Certainly they have played a large part in the lives and interests of a great number of students. They appeared early, one in 1849, two in 1850, and one in 1854, and were looked upon with jealousy by the old literary societies. Then, after twenty-five years, four more appeared, soon after the University moved to West Philadelphia. From 1890 onward during the next thirty years, a new fraternity appeared almost every year; in 1908 and again in 1912, there were three established in each of those years. The dates of these foundations, the relationships of the fraternities to one another, the satisfaction they have been to their members and advantage to the University, the appearance of the first fraternity house, Psi Upsilon, on the campus, and the gradual capture of eligible sites in the vicinity of the University by a score of fraternities since, their use for

housing the Students' Army Training Corps during the World War, the growth and then the elimination of abuses by an Interfraternity Agreement in 1926; all these facts and considerations have been carefully collected by Dr. A. H. Quinn for this book, but an attempt to weave them into the general story, each in its proper place, has proved hopeless and has been abandoned.

The religious interests of students at Pennsylvania have been the object of more experiment than at most institutions, because of its traditional freedom from denominational bias. An interesting record might be made of the "varieties of religious experience," to use Mr. James's expression, of its students during two hundred years. Has there ever been in the colonial College or the later University a group of devotees corresponding to the "Holy Club" of Oxford in the eighteenth century, or the Anglo-Catholics of the nineteenth, or the Oxford group of the twentieth? The Christian Association has in its possession the minute book of a group calling themselves The Christian Society of the University of Pennsylvania, giving a record of their proceedings in the years 1857, 1858, and 1859, with a list of their fifty-six members. The Young Men's Christian Association was introduced at the University in 1892 and along with its other activities began the collection of funds that led eventually to the erection of the noble building that was completed and dedicated in 1922. Observers of the progress of events at the University during recent decades will have noticed the appointment of representatives of the various denominations to work with their own students, the religious work of the Young Men's Christian Association and, under the present administration and with the special interest of Mr. and Mrs. Gates, the admirable work being done by the official Chaplain of the University, Rev. W. Brooke Stabler.

This list of neglected subjects is given to indicate some of the matter which should have been included in the foregoing account if it were to be a picture of the life of the University during its two hundred years. But this is a history, not a picture; an attempt to trace the development of an organism—to watch the unfolding of a plot—to follow the course of a stream.

As one observes the course of events it becomes abundantly evident that the most marked characteristic of recent times has been the constantly increasing service of the University to the community. So one comes to think of the history of the University as not so much a drama, but rather a "theme with variations." The variations have been numerous, the theme was long ago announced by Franklin in the *Proposals*: that the students would by their studies attain "Benignity of Mind . . . consisting in an Inclination joined with an Ability to serve Mankind, one's Country, Friends and Family; which Ability is (with the blessing of God) to be acquired or greatly increased by true Learning, and should indeed be the great Aim and End of all Learning."

THE END

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

PROVOSTS

William Smith, 1754-1779
John Ewing, 1779-1802
John McDowell, 1806-1810
John Andrews, 1810-1813
Frederick Beasley, 1813-1828
William H. DeLancey, 1828-1834
John Ludlow, 1834-1853
Henry Vethake, 1854-1859
Daniel R. Goodwin, 1860-1868
Charles J. Stillé, 1868-1880
William Pepper, 1881-1894
Charles Custis Harrison, 1894-1910
Edgar Fahs Smith, 1910-1920
Josiah H. Penniman, 1921-1939
George W. McClelland, 1939-

VICE-PROVOSTS

Francis Alison, 1755-1779
David Rittenhouse, 1780-1782
Samuel Magaw, 1782-1791
John Andrews, 1789-1810
Robert Patterson, 1810-1813
Robert M. Patterson, 1814-1828
Robert Adrain, 1828-1834
Samuel B. Wylie, 1834-1845
Henry Reed, 1845
Henry Vethake, 1845-1854
John F. Frazer, 1855-1868
Charles P. Krauth, 1872-1883
Ezra Otis Kendall, 1883-1894
George S. Fullerton, 1894-1898
Edgar Fahs Smith, 1898-1910
Josiah H. Penniman, 1911-1920

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

James Hartley Merrick, 1922-1925

George W. McClelland, 1925-1931

George A. Brakeley, 1926-1931

PRESIDENTS

Josiah H. Penniman, 1923-1926

Thomas S. Gates, 1930-

VICE-PRESIDENTS

George A. Brakeley, 1926-1939

George W. McClelland, 1925-1939

Alfred N. Richards, 1939-

Alfred Stengel, 1931-1939

Herbert F. Goodrich, 1931-1940

Paul H. Musser, 1939-

William H. DuBarry, 1939-

INDEX

Aberdeen, University of, 41, 62, 81, 102
"Abrogation of charters," 124-25
Academic Council, 365-66
Academic freedom, 220, 367-71, 404
Academy: aid from Proprietaries, 39, 43, 61; buildings, 24, 35, 37-38, 194, 213, 304; charter, 39; contributors, 30, 36-37, 39, 43, 61, 97, 171, 173; curriculum, 31, 71-79, 154; earliest pupils, 37-38; enrollment, 37-38, 59, 72, 74, 79, 121, 137; experimental nature, 33; Faculty, 37, 73-79, 153, 178, 220, 223; finances, 36-37, 43, 59, 61-62; first scholarship, 36, founding, 27-31, 51; Franklin's influence, 27-31, 170-75, 312, 342, 395; Indian students, 40; move to Ninth Street, 182, "New Building," 35-38, 53; opening ceremonies, 37-38; part in Revolution, 118-19; religious character, 32-33, 172; student life, 94-95; teacher training, 39-40, 184; transition into College, 40ff., 87, 153, 161, 178-79, 194, 245; Trustees, *see* Trustees, Academy; tuition fees, 31
Academy of Fine Arts, 419
— Music, 315
— Natural Sciences, 300, 428
Accounting courses, 295, 347-49
Act of 1779, 50, 103, 116, 122-25, 129-30, 140, 144, 146, 148-50, 152, 259, 282
— 1789, 50, 150-52, 160
— 1791, 50, 164
Adams, James, 15
—, John, 159, 181
—, Robert, 294
—, Sarah, 301
Adgate, Andrew, 142-43, 405
Adjutant General (U.S.), 381
Administrative Council, 420
Administrative structure, 30-34, 42, 44, 169, 177-78, 184-90, 192-94, 220, 264, 268, 278-82, 285-87, 364-65, 367, 414-22
Admiralty, Judge of (Pennsylvania), 130
Adrain, Robert (Vice-Provost 1828-1834), 193, 220, 222
Advertisements, 23, 102, 151, 153, 159, 295, 297
"Age of Benevolence," 22
Age of Reason, The, 137
Age of students, 55, 86, 161, 179, 187, 198, 200, 249-50, 259, 406
Agnew, D. Hayes, 268
Agricultural chemistry, 254
Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, 255-56
Agricultural Society, 143, 309
Agriculture, 83, 143, 168, 205, 254-56, 309
Agriculture, Mines, Manufactures, and the Mechanic Arts, College of, 254-56, 261, 264
Alexander, J. W., 239-40
Alison, Francis (Vice-Provost 1754-1779), 14, 73, 75, 80-81, 93, 95, 112-13, 120, 123, 131, 173
Allen, Andrew, 212
—, George, 224-25, 246, 250
—, Harrison, 300-01, 318, 357
—, William, 13, 28, 29, 38, 95, 108, 112
Almshouse, 99, 261-62, 269
Alumni, 115, 230-33, 236, 292-93, 306, 313-16, 320-22, 348, 362, 367, 369-70, 375, 377-79, 382-400, 407, 415-17, 421, 423
Alumni, Central Committee of, 320-22, 383
Alumni Clubs: Associated, 394, 396-99; Federation of, 384; local, 322, 384, 392
Alumni Committees: Central Committee, 320-22, 383; Committee of One Hundred, 388-94, 419; Welfare Committee, 384-85; sub-committee on policy, 388, 390-92; Valley Forge Committee, 396
Alumni Day, 385
Alumni Records Office, 415
Alumni Register, 92

Alumni Secretary, 383
 Alumni Society (*see also* General Alumni Society), 49, 50, 230-33, 320
 Alumni Trustees, 320-21, 383, 393, 416-17, 420
 American Academy of Political and Social Science, 289
 American Association for the Advancement of Education, 245
 American Association of University Professors, 370
 American Iron Association, 239
 American Institute of Architects, 311
 American Institute of Biblical Literature, 346
American Magazine, 82, 110
 American Philosophical Society, 11, 29, 77, 94, 133, 141-42, 152-53, 155, 159, 169, 180, 196, 223, 240, 343, 361
 American Telephone and Telegraph Company, 411
 American Tract Society, 241
 Anatomical Hall, 182, 205, 212-13, 228, 237
 Anatomy, 101, 136, 182, 205, 213-14, 272, 275, 300, 357
 Anatomy Laboratory, 334
 André, John, 138
 Andrews, John (Vice-Provost 1791-1810, Provost 1810-1813), 89, 151, 167-68, 182, 186, 196
 ——, John (of York), 14
 Anglicans (*see also* Church of England and Episcopalians), 17, 22, 32, 61, 105, 114, 120, 122-23, 166, 172, 177, 186
 Animal Pathology, School of, 427
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 289
 Annapolis, 244, 249
 Applied mathematics, 240
 Appreciation of art, 425
 Apprentices (medical), 211
 Aquaria, 302
 Arboretum, 429-31
 Archaeological Association, 351
 Archaeology, 323, 349-53
 Archbishop of Canterbury, 62-64, 122-23
 Architecture, 247, 263-65, 310-12, 341, 344, 382, 402, 425, 431
 Archives, vii, 23, 64, 116, 131, 152, 167, 375
 Arctic shipwreck, 243
 Arithmetic, *see* Mathematics
 Armistice (1918), 381
 Armory, 250
 Arnold, Benedict, 138-39
 Arnold Arboretum, 430
 Art, history and appreciation of, 425
 Arts, Department of, *see* College of Arts and Sciences
 Arts, graphic and plastic, 405
 Ashton, James W., 251
 Assembly (Pennsylvania): Provincial, 9, 26, 27, 28, 30, 61, 70, 101, 105, 107-12, 114, 171; state, *see* Pennsylvania Legislature
 Assembly balls, 9, 10, 20, 75, 152
 Assistant to the President, 416
 Associate Trustees, 417-18
 Associated Alumni Clubs, 394, 396-99
 Associated Pennsylvania Clubs, 384
 Astor Library, 219
 Astronomy, 83, 132-33, 168, 195, 339, 356, 410
 Athletic Association, 313-17, 320, 344
 Athletic coaches, 423
 Athletic fields, 315-17, 320, 344, 397, 424
 Athletics, vi, 54, 94, 312-17, 320, 383, 421, 423-24
 Attorney-General of Pennsylvania, 30, 124, 130, 165, 230
 Attorney-General (U.S.), 198
Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin, 15, 24, 173
 Auxiliary School of Medicine, 272-73, 296, 300, 304, 346, 430
 Babylonian expeditions, 323, 349-51
 Bache, Alexander Dallas, 220, 222-23, 238
 Bancroft, George, 343
 Bank of Pennsylvania, 184
 Bank of the United States, 189
 Banking courses, 290, 295
 Baptists, 5, 13, 21, 65, 77, 112, 123, 142, 177
 Barker, George F., 304, 318
 Barnwell, J. G., 323
 Barnwell Foundation, 323
 Barré, Isaac, 90
 Barrett's Gymnasium, 314
 Barton, Benjamin Smith, 166, 202-04, 208, 213-15
 ——, Mrs. John Rhea, 275
 ——, W. P. C., 204-07
 Bartram, John, 12, 201
 Basketball, 424
 Bauer, Will, 378
 Bayard, John, 130

Beasley, Frederick (Provost 1813-1828): appointment to Provostship, 186; attempted reforms, 186-87, 197, 220-21; background, 186; dismissal, 193-94, 219; Professor of Moral Philosophy, 186; relations with students, 187, 190-92, 197; relations with Trustees, 192-93, 197, 286

Beef-steak Club, 8

Belles lettres, 169, 224, 244, 257

Benezet, Anthony, 4, 14, 21
—, John, 24

Bennett, Joseph M., 307-08, 403, 407-08
—, Mary Alice, 305
—, Thomas P., 199

Bennett Club, 403

Bennett Hall, 308, 338, 403

Bequests, *see* Gifts

Beveridge, John, 73-75, 89, 95

Bible courses, 292

Biblical Literature, American Institute of, 346

Bicentennial Campaign, 397

Biddle, Nicholas, 189, 219
—, Thomas, 232

Big Quad, 344

Billeting of troops, 115-17

Billings, John S., 325-26

Binney, Horace, 189, 271

Biological Farm, 357, 427

Biological Hall, 301, 354, 430

Biology, Department of (*see also* Wistar Institute): administration, 365; biological farms, 357, 427; botanical garden, 303, 430; degrees, 302; enrollment, 301; equipment, 301-02; Faculty, 300-01, 339; founding, 247, 300, 303; research, 302, 410; women students, 301-03, 407

Biophysics, 429

Bishop Potter's plan, 244-48

Bishop White Dormitory, 344, 355

Bispham, George Fisher, 237

Blackstone, William, 235

Blaine, Martha, 139

Blair, Samuel, 14

Blanchard, Anna, Harriet, and Maria, 374

Blockley Farm, 261, 333, 429

Board of Business Education, 417, 426
—, Engineering, 417
—, Fine Arts, 417
—, Graduate Education and Research, 412-13, 417
—, Health (Philadelphia), 182

Board of Liberal Arts, 417
—, Medical Affairs, 417
—, Teacher Training, 417
—, Trustees, *see* Trustees

Bolles, Albert S., 289-90

Bolton Farm, 427

Bond, Thomas, 102, 108, 130, 136

Bookkeeping courses, 134, 169

Booth, James C., 238-39

Boston Latin School, 74

Botanical garden, 203-07, 251, 303, 429-31

Botanical Hall, 430

Botany, 83, 102, 201-07, 254, 272, 300-01, 303, 429-31

Boxing, 314

Braddock, Edward, 105

Brakeley, George A. (Vice-Provost 1926-1931, Vice-President 1931-1939), 415-16

Brégy, François Amédée, 264

British Crown, 9, 44, 69, 108, 112, 122, 125

British Museum, 350

British occupation of Philadelphia, 89, 116-17, 120

Brockden, Charles, 24, 27

Brokerage courses, 295

Brooks, Phillips, 251, 287

Brown University, 85, 117, 177, 227, 232-33

Browne, Nathaniel B., 262

Brumbaugh, Martin G., 401

Bryn Mawr College, 308

Budget, 121, 145, 418, 422

Budget Committee, 394

Buildings: Academy, 24, 35, 37-38, 194, 213, 304; College, 53-57, 69, 71, 88, 132, 152, 155, 161, 163, 180, 343; Fourth and Arch streets, 24, 35, 37-38, 53-57, 69, 71, 88, 132, 142-44, 152, 155, 161, 163, 180, 194, 212-15, 261, 304, 307, 397; Ninth Street, 180-82, 187, 197, 206-07, 213-15, 228-30, 236, 261, 303, 314, 343, 430; University, 180-82, 187, 197, 206-07, 212-15, 228-30, 236-37, 261-63, 265, 269-70, 273-75, 278, 301, 303, 307-08, 310-12, 316-17, 319, 322-24, 327-28, 330, 333-34, 337, 339-45, 351-52, 355-58, 364-65, 374, 415, 425, 430, 433; University of the State of Pennsylvania, 142-44, 152-53

Bullen, Alexander, 14

Bullock, John, 195

Burd, Edward S., 206

INDEX

Burd, "Neddy," 75
 Burk, Jesse Y., 49, 335
 Burr, Aaron, 81
 Business courses, *see* Wharton School
 Business Education, Board of, 417, 426
 By-laws of the University (*see also* Statutes), 135, 286, 371

Cabinet of Science, 205
 Cadwalader, John, 335
 ——, Lambert, 119
 ——, Thomas, 13
 Caldwell, Charles, 205
 California, University of, 289, 391, 412
 Calvinists, 36
 Cambridge University, 70, 104, 307
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, 62-64, 122-23
 Carnegie Foundation, 361
 Carnegie Institution, 411
 Carpenter house, 4
 Carpenters Company, 6
 Carpenters Hall, 6, 118
 Carroll, T. K., 199
 Carson, Hampton L., 321
 ——, John, 213
 ——, Joseph, vi
 Carter, William T., 407
 Carter Foundation of Child Helping, 407
 Catalogues, 49, 50, 205, 229, 234, 275, 288, 297, 303-04, 358
 Cattell, James McKean, 354
 "Centennial" celebration of 1849, 49
 Centennial Exposition of 1876, 49, 287, 326
 Central Committee of the Alumni, 320-22, 383
 Certificates of proficiency, 241, 347-48
 Chaff, 431
 Chamberlain, Joshua L., viii
 Champollion, Jean François, 248
 Chandler, John, 24
 ——, Samuel, 62, 63, 123
 ——, Theophilus P., 312
 Chapel, 187, 205, 221, 226, 252, 264-65, 267, 280, 316, 342
 Chaplain, 433
 Chapman, Nathaniel, 212, 214
 Charity School: abandonment, 303-04, 307; buildings, 23, 26, 41, 55, 163, 174, 182, 307, 343; charter, 39, 45, 48; delay in opening, 26, 38, 45; donations, 36, 59; enrollment, 38, 59, 121, 195, 304; history, viii, 118; opening, 38, 45; original trust, 15-16, 22, 49-51, 163, 165; singing instruction, 92; teachers, 38, 58, 304
 Charleston, S.C., financial aid to College, 67-68
 Charter of Pennsylvania, 9
 Charters (1753 and 1755), 39-41, 43-45, 48, 50, 70, 78, 80, 123-25, 131-32, 150-51, 163, 165, 231, 282, 303-04, 417, 420
 Chastellux, François Jean, Marquis of, 140-41, 164
 Chemistry, vii, 83, 102, 136, 168, 182, 195, 205, 212-13, 215, 220, 223, 229, 238-40, 246, 254, 264-65, 270, 275, 277, 298, 304, 339, 346, 361-62, 386, 410
 Chemistry Building, 334, 339, 355
 Cheyney, Edward P., viii, 294
 Chicago, University of, 289, 294
 Chicago alumni, 322
 Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, 13, 101, 112, 130, 143, 165, 189, 200, 305
 Child Helping, 407
 Child labor legislation, 368
 Child psychology, 353-55, 401
 Christ Church, 10, 14, 15, 17, 21, 25, 28, 30, 32, 53, 60, 74, 96, 106, 170, 219
 Christian Association, 438
 Christian Society, 433
 Chronology courses, 82, 184, 161
 Church of England (*see also* Anglicans and Episcopalians), 4, 5, 36, 122-23, 130, 172
 Cincinnati, Society of the, 155
 Circulatory diseases, 429
 City Committee, 118
 City Council, 9, 10, 28, 30, 33, 36, 171, 262
 City support, 36, 171, 262, 352
 City Tavern, 159
 Civil engineering, 240
 Civil law, 84
 Civil War, 199, 240, 244, 249-54, 257, 259, 272, 289, 311, 379
 Clarke, Hugh A., 265-67
 Clark's Hall, 4
 Class alumni organizations, 322
 Class of 1862, 335
 —— 1887, vii, 344
 Classical School, *see* Latin School
 Classics (*see also* Greek and Latin), 31, 58, 73-75, 80, 82-84, 86, 93, 103, 114, 132, 134-35, 151, 154-55, 161, 167-69, 172-73, 183, 187, 220-21, 223-25, 244-45, 259, 277, 366
 Clay, Henry, 231

Clergymen as Provosts, 61-62, 130, 132, 151, 186, 219, 227, 257

Cleveland, Samuel, 264

Clinical Laboratory, 327-28, 337, 409, 429

Clinical medicine, 102, 136, 212, 276, 327-28, 337, 409

Clymer, George, 115, 121

Coats, John, 24

Coeducation, *see* Women, admission of

Cogswell, Joseph Green, 219

Colden, Cadwallader, 343, 395

Coleman, William, 30

Collateral Courses, 346-49, 358, 382

College Boat Club, 314

College Chapel, 187, 205, 221, 252, 264-65, 267, 280, 316, 342

College Collateral Courses, 346-49, 358, 382

College Courses for Teachers, 345-46, 358, 382, 400-04, 407, 417

College Hall: Fourth and Arch streets, 88, 92, 121, 129, 139, 142-44, 159, 166, 181, 230, 236, 250, 266; West Philadelphia, 237, 263-65, 274, 281, 312, 315-16, 322

College of Arts and Sciences (*see also* Scientific School): alumni, 199-200, 230, 252-53, 258, 384-88; barring of women, 306-07, 407-08; Bishop Potter's plan, 244-48; buildings, 228-29, 261, 263-65; Civil War participation, 249-51; classical requirements, 366; degrees, 298, 339, 382; Depression period, 176-79, 182-95, 207, 258; dissolution of Faculty (1828), 193-94, 219; elective system, 276-77, 366; endowment fund, 277-78; enrollment, 185-86, 192, 194, 199, 225-26, 245, 259, 358, 382, 384; expansion, 219-28, 271, 277, 366; Faculty, 167, 176, 184-85, 190, 192-93, 195-96, 202, 204-07, 220, 222-25, 238-44, 246-48, 257, 259-60, 263-67, 280-82, 288-89, 295, 306, 312, 339, 358, 368; organization, 190, 220, 328, 364-67, 416-17; Summer School, 346-47; Valley Forge plan, 394-97

College of Liberal Arts for Women, 403, 407-08, 425

College of Mirania, 42, 44

College of Philadelphia: aristocratic tinge, 9, 120, 166; attitude toward Revolution, 120; buildings, 16, 53-57, 69, 71, 88, 132, 152, 155, 161, 163, 180, 343; change of title, 123-25; curricu-

lum, 71-87, 161; date of origin, 45-52; enrollment, 59, 72, 107, 121, 157; estimate, 125; Faculty, 44, 48, 73-81, 91, 111, 124, 129, 131, 147-48, 151; Faculty tenure, 291; financial problems, 54-55, 57-71, 121, 144, 161; founding, 40-45; Franklin's influence, 170-75; gifts, 58-59, 61-71, 144, 161, 180, 258, 278; legislative action, 120-25, 149-50, 231; length of course, 82, 84-85, 346; political involvement, 104-25, 146-50, 172; Provost Smith's influence, 80, 172, 178, 285; religious character, 66, 85, 172, 433; restoration (1789), 146-59, 176, 202; student life, 87-96; suspension during Revolution, 116-17, 119-20; Trustees, *see* Trustees, College of Philadelphia; tuition fees, 55, 59, 71; union with the University of the State of Pennsylvania, 162-69, 176, 180, 182-85, 200, 202, 207-08, 285, 372

College of Physicians (Edinburgh), 99

College of Physicians (London), 99

College Yard, 115, 250

Colonial Philadelphia, *see* Philadelphia

Colors, 314-15, 348

Columbia Medical School, 227

Columbia University, 42, 47, 51, 54, 60, 63-64, 81, 84, 116, 123, 132, 164, 177, 186, 222, 285, 309, 335, 402

Columbian Exposition, 318

Colwell Library, 324

Combined Musical Clubs, 432

Commencements, 59, 85-93, 100, 103, 109, 115, 117, 186-88, 140, 157, 159, 172, 187, 229-30, 236, 251, 266, 322, 329-32, 334

Commerce courses, 290

Commercial Museum, 332

Committee of One Hundred, 388-94, 419

Committee on Correspondence, 115

——— Degrees, 339

——— Policy, 388, 390-92

——— Property, 374

——— Research, 339, 412-13

——— Safety, 115

——— the Welfare of the University, 384-85

——— Ways and Means, 61, 329, 334

Common Sense, 118, 137

Community Library, 427

Community service, 260, 285, 310, 320, 326, 345-49, 352-53, 384, 400, 404-05, 434

Comparative anatomy, 205, 272, 300

INDEX

Composition courses, 161, 168
 Comptroller of the University, 395, 414,
 423
 Conard, Solomon W., 207, 237
 Concert Room, 10
 Conestoga Wagon Tavern, 8
 Confederate States, 199, 250, 252-53
 Confiscated estates, 123, 144-45, 160, 182,
 184, 212
 Congregationalists, 177, 224, 241
 Congress (U.S.), 159
 Conscientious objectors, 380-81
 Constituent boards, 417-18, 426
 Constitution of Pennsylvania, *see* Pennsylvania, State of
 Constitutional Convention, 74, 91, 158
 Constitutional Convention of Pennsylvania, 91
 Constitutional Party, 118, 119-20, 147,
 149, 161
 Constitutional Society, 142
Constitutions for a Public Academy in the City of Philadelphia, 30-34, 39, 40,
 78, 173, 291
 Continental Army, 115-16, 119
 Continental Congress, 91, 118-19, 137,
 189-90
 Contributions, *see* Gifts
 Controller-General of Pennsylvania, 201
 Cooper, James Fenimore, 227
 —, Thomas, 205, 212
 Cope, Edward D., 301
 Coppée, Henry, 199, 244, 249-50, 252,
 257
 Cornell University, 277, 311-12, 410
 Corporation finance course, 295
 Council of Censors, 147-48
 Country location, 34, 54, 94, 180, 312,
 342, 394-97
Courier de l'Amérique, 141
 Court of Common Pleas, 417
 Court House (Second and Market
 streets), 8, 17, 21
 Courtenay, E. H., 222
 Covent Garden, 65, 92
 Coxe, John R., 212, 214
 Craddock, Ida C., 306
 Crawford, J. P. W., 387
 —, Samuel W., 253
 Cressbrook Farm, 395-97
 Cresson, John C., 263
 Cricket, 313-14
 Cricket Club, 313
 Crooked Billet Tavern, 7
 Cross, Michael, 266
 Crown (British), 9, 44, 69, 108, 112, 122,
 125
 Crusé, Christian Frederic, 226
 Cullen, William, 99
 Cultural Olympics, 404-05
 Curriculum Committee, 366
 Curriculum of the Academy and College, 31, 71-87, 131-35, 161, 168-69,
 172-73, 184-85, 187, 201-02, 221-25,
 242-44, 254-56, 259, 272, 276-77, 349,
 366-67, 417
 Curtis Publishing Company, 34
 Curzon, Lady, 64
 Dancing, 93, 405
 Darby, Edwin T., 268
 Date of origin, 45-52
 Davidson, James, 73-74, 131, 134, 151,
 167, 196
 —, Robert, 134
 Day, Frank M., 341
 Dean of the College, 297, 336, 351, 363,
 365-66, 383
 Debating, 87, 187, 196-99
 Declaration of Independence, 80, 86, 91,
 118
 Deed to "New Building," 35-36, 41
 Defalcations, 194
 Deficits, 58, 60, 65, 67, 71, 144-46, 226,
 362, 375, 378-79, 392
 Degrees, 40-41, 43-44, 48, 86, 88-89, 102-
 03, 115, 136-37, 141, 152, 158, 165, 241,
 347, 367, 386, 417; A.B., 86, 89-90, 92,
 102-03, 135, 137-38, 157, 159, 238, 259,
 277, 298, 346, 363, 366, 402, 406; B.F.,
 291; B.L., 232, 236, 305; B. Med., 103,
 137, 156-57, 159; B. Music, 267; B.
 Physic, 103-04; B.S., 232, 366; B.S.
 Aux. to Med., 273; B.S. in Biology,
 302; B.S. in Education, 402, 406; B.S.
 in Economics, 291; D.D.S., 268; D.D.,
 186; D. Music, 267; D. Public Health,
 326; Honorary, 40, 77, 90-91, 121, 133,
 137, 140, 186, 222, 225, 267; LL.D., 91,
 140, 225, 329; M.A., 77, 90-92, 113-15,
 121, 130, 133, 137-38, 159, 222, 298,
 338-39, 347; M.D., 102-03, 136-37, 140,
 156-57, 159, 208-09, 216, 229; M.L.,
 410; M.S., 298; M.S. in Education, 406;
 Ph.D., 272-73, 296-98, 302, 305, 347,
 363, 409
 Degrees, Committee on, 389
 Degrees for Women, 302, 304-05, 346
 DeLancey, William Heathcote (Provost
 1828-1834): addresses, 221, 229; ap-

pointment to Provostship, 219; background, 219; Professor of Moral Philosophy, 220, 224; reforms, 220-21, 225, 227, 276; relations with students, 198, 225-26, 313; relations with Trustees, 220-21, 286; resignation, 227; Trustee, 219-21, 227

Delaware College, 90, 200

Delaware, University of, 47

del Terra, Correa, 207

Dental Building, 334, 355

Dental Review, 431

Dentistry, School of: administration, 268, 364-65, 367; admission of women, 306, 400; degrees, 268, 357; *Dental Review*, 431; establishment, 267-71, 273, 358; Faculty, 268, 306; location and buildings, 268-70, 275, 312, 334, 356-57; merger with Evans Dental Institute, 356-57; predoctoral courses, 382, 386

Depression, 382, 394, 422

Diagnostic Hospital, 428

Dickinson, John, 113, 130, 211

Dickinson College, 176-77, 199

Dickson, Philemon, 118

Diplomas, 241

Discipline, 74, 95, 161, 188, 190-93, 220-22, 225-26, 280-81, 367, 421-22

Dispensary, 211

Disputations, 83, 85-87, 90, 103

Dissection, 100-01, 212, 270, 275

Dissenters, 4, 62, 110, 123

Division of Schools, 364-67

Dixon, Samuel G., 321

Dolley, Charles S., 301

Donaldson, Henry Herbert, 357-58

Donations, *see* Gifts

Doolittle, Charles L., 356

—, Eric, 356

Dorizas, Michael, 423

Dormitories: Fourth Street, 54, 55-56, 65, 71, 151, 179, 182, 343; West Philadelphia, 315-16, 320, 334, 340, 342-45, 355, 374, 380, 397, 402-03, 408

Dorsey, John Syng, 204, 212

Dove, David James, 76-77, 89, 298

Dramatic societies (*see also* Plays), 431

Drawing courses, 72, 255, 263, 311

Drexel Institute, 308

Drury Lane Theatre, 65

Duché, Jacob, 74-75, 92, 119, 122

Duhring, Louis A., 377

Duhring bequest, 377

Dulles, Charles W., viii

DuPonceau, Peter, 189

Dutch Reformed Church, 5, 266

Dutch settlers in Philadelphia, 4

Earth sciences, 428

Eastburn, Robert, 24

École des Beaux Arts, 311

Economics, 84, 289, 291, 294, 298, 324, 369

Edinburgh, University of, 62, 91, 97-99, 101-04, 202, 210, 289

Education, School of: administration, 402, 417; Cultural Olympics, 404-05; degrees, 402, 406; enrollment, 402; kindergarten unit, 406; nursing education, 406; organization, 401-03; professional policy, 403, 407; Schoolmen's Week, 403-04; vocational education, 406

"Education for leadership," 384-87, 391

Educational Council, 420

Elective system, 135, 233, 276-77, 302, 366

Electoral Commission, 361

Electrical engineering, 425-26

Electrical experiments, 12, 28, 75, 77, 99, 110, 133, 168

Eliot, Charles W., 277

Employment research, 410

Endowments and foundations, 65, 66, 144, 147, 183, 227, 256, 262, 272-73, 275, 277-78, 287, 299, 305, 307-10, 319, 325-28, 337-38, 340, 349, 357, 364, 377, 385, 392, 396, 398-400, 407-12, 416, 426-27, 429-30

Engineering, 281, 289-42, 247, 254, 358, 386, 408, 417, 425-26, 431

Engineering Education, Board of, 417

Engineering Building, 356

England, Church of (*see* Church of England)

English courses (*see also* English literature), 31, 58, 76-78, 82, 84, 93, 134-35, 154, 168-69, 172-73, 224, 243-44, 293, 298, 363

English literature, 243-44, 249, 257, 264, 277, 292, 345

English School, 29, 41, 42, 72-73, 76-79, 81, 91, 121, 131, 134, 142, 144, 153-55, 169

English settlers in Philadelphia, 4

Enrollment: Academy, 37-38, 59, 72, 74, 79, 121, 137; Charity School, 38, 59, 72, 121, 195, 304; College of Arts and Sciences, 185-86, 192, 194, 199, 225-26,

INDEX

Enrollment (*continued*) 245, 259, 358, 382, 384; College of Philadelphia, 59, 72, 107, 121, 157; Evening, Extension, Collateral, and Summer courses, 348-49, 358, 382; Graduate School, 297-98, 358, 382; School of Education, 402; School of Law, 236, 259, 382; School of Medicine, 103-04, 121, 137, 157, 160, 208-09, 212, 228, 259, 271, 358, 382; School of Veterinary Medicine, 310, 358; Scientific School, 206, 241; University, 316, 330, 358, 378, 381, 384, 394, 408, 418; University of the State of Pennsylvania, 137, 159-60; Wharton School, 295, 358, 382; women, 402, 408

Episcopal Academy, 151

Episcopal Divinity School, 350

Episcopalians (*see also* Anglicans), 13, 14, 32, 80, 89, 90, 130, 132, 172, 224

Essig, Charles J., 268

Ethics, 43, 83, 85

Evans, Edward, 24
—, Thomas W., 356

Evans Dental Institute, 356-57

Evening School of Accounts and Finance, 295, 347-49, 358, 382, 384-85, 392, 402

Everett, Edward, 219

Ewing, John (Provost 1779-1802): activities as Provost, 138, 140-41, 144, 285; death, 186; election as Provost, 132, 169; political activities, 112-13; protests to Trustees, 162, 169, 184-85; Provost's House, 182, 151; pupil of Dr. Alison, 80; scientific interests, 132, 134, 168, 195-96; substitute teacher, 108; Trustee, 130

Examinations, 75, 86, 88, 103, 184, 298

Executive Board of the Trustees, 419
— Council, 420
— Council of Pennsylvania, 91, 124, 129, 139-40, 165, 231

Expense of students, 55

Experimental philosophy, 103, 121, 132, 134, 143

Extension courses, 289, 295, 348-49, 382, 384-85, 392, 394, 402, 417

Extension School of Accounts and Finance, 295, 348-49, 382, 384-85, 392

Extra-curricular activities (*see also* Athletics, Fraternities, Music, Plays, Religious interests, Student publications), vi, 87-96, 258, 265, 334, 340-42, 344, 408, 422, 431-33

Faculty: Academy, 37, 73-79, 153, 178, 220, 223; College of Philadelphia, 44, 48, 73-81, 91, 111, 124, 129, 131, 147-48, 151; University of the State of Pennsylvania, 132-35, 144; athletic coaches, 423; Department of Biology, 300-01, 339; College of Arts and Sciences, 167, 176, 184-85, 190, 192-93, 195-96, 202, 204-07, 220, 222-25, 238-44, 246-48, 257, 259-60, 263-67, 280-82, 288-89, 295, 306, 312, 339, 358, 368; College of Liberal Arts for Women, 408; Graduate School, 296-98, 308, 338-39, 358; military training, 249-50; School of Dentistry, 268, 306; School of Education, 402; School of Law, 91, 158, 205, 234-37, 267-68; School of Medicine, 100-02, 131, 136, 166, 182, 202-05, 208-16, 260, 268, 272, 279, 305-06, 316, 358, 365, 409; School of Music, 266-67; School of Social Work, 428; Scientific School, 205-07, 237-41, 264, 297, 339; Wharton School, 289-95, 297, 306, 339; Academic Council, 365-66; academic freedom, 220, 367-71; admission of women, 306; Committee on University Policy, 391-92; conservatism, 246-48, 259-60, 286, 291; dissolution (1828), 193-94, 219; Harrison testimonial dinner, 358; hostility to athletics, 314; leave of absence, 302; number, 167, 189, 246, 330, 418; organization, 365-66, 421; relations with Trustees, 178, 184-85, 188-90, 192-94, 219-22, 280, 282, 291-94, 366-71, 390; remuneration, 31, 43, 58, 131, 144-46, 162, 185, 225, 239, 242, 266, 270, 272, 274-75, 277, 279, 401; reorganization (1791-1792), 166-69, (1828) 220, 222-26; research, 301-02, 319, 328, 339, 357, 409-13, 426-27, 429; tenure, 76-77, 291-94, 368-71; Valley Forge plan, 396; University Fund, 399

Faculty houses, 56, 69, 71, 77, 182

Faculty Research Committee, 412-13

Falls of Schuylkill, 56, 62, 119

Farmer, John, 130

Farmers School, 255

Federal land grant, 253-56, 372, 427

Federation of Alumni Clubs, 384

Fee system, 158, 167, 185, 190, 204, 206, 210-12, 214-15, 226, 228, 239-41, 266, 270, 272, 274-75, 277, 279

Fellowships, *see* Scholarships

Fencing, 93, 314

Field House, 424
 Field sports, *see* Track athletics
 Fields, Miss, 300
 Finance and Economy, School of, 288
 Finance courses, 295, 347-49
 Financial problems: Academy, 36; College, 54-55, 57-71, 121, 161; University of the State of Pennsylvania, 144-46, 160-61; University of Pennsylvania, 182-84, 194-95, 200-01, 226, 253-56, 277-78, 325-26, 330-31, 340, 362, 364, 371-79, 392-96, 398-400, 418-19, 421-23
 Fine Arts, Board of, 417
 ——, School of, 312, 355, 402, 407, 417, 425, 432
 Finegan, Thomas E., 390
 Finegan Plan, 390-94, 427
 Finley, Samuel, 97-98, 102
 Finley's Academy, 97-98, 102
 First Presbyterian Church, 40, 80
 Fitch, John, 134
 Flower, Reese Wall, 356
 Flower Observatory, 356
 Football, 314, 424
 Forensic disputation, 83, 85-87, 90, 103
 Fort Sumter, 249-50, 253
 Fothergill, John, 97, 99, 101
 Foundations (*see also* Endowments), 357
 Founders' Night, 397
 Founding, 27-52
 Fourth and Arch streets buildings, 24, 35, 37-38, 53-57, 69, 71, 88, 132, 142-44, 152, 155, 161, 163, 180, 194, 212-15, 261, 304, 307, 397
 Fox, George S., 429
 Fox Endowment for Medical Research, 429
 Fraley, Frederick, 279, 306
 Francis, Tench, 28-30, 39, 173
 Franck, Leonard George, 264
 Franklin, Benjamin: *Account of the Academy*, 29; advocacy of country location, 34, 54, 94, 180, 312, 342, 395; alienation from College, 154-55, 171, 285; arrival in Philadelphia, 3; attacks on, 77, 109-12; attitude toward aristocracy, 7; attitude toward Whitefield, 18-19, 21; *Autobiography*, 15, 24, 173; *Constitutions for a Public Academy*, 30-34, 39, 40, 78, 173, 291; death, 155, 171; descendants, 93-94, 223; estimate, 170-75; financial contributions, 171; founder, 15, 27, 48-49, 165, 172-73, 222; *Idea of the English School*, 29, 41, 42, 76, 81; ideas on education, 29, 31, 73, 76, 82-83, 154, 172, 184, 309, 394; influence on curriculum, 31, 172-73; Junto, 7, 12, 29-30, 143; leading citizen, 28, 140, 155; library, 12; missions abroad, 97, 109, 112, 114, 171, 231; *Observations*, 29; opposition to Proprietaries, 67, 104, 109, 112, 114; American Philosophical Society, 11, 133; *Plain Truth*, 7; Presidency of Trustees, 30, 109, 151, 171, 173; president of Pennsylvania Executive Council, 140; printer, 44, 67, 106; *Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania*, 15, 29-34, 41, 54, 81, 94, 173, 180, 395, 434; relations with Provost Smith, 41-43, 109-10, 113, 155, 173; retirement from business, 6, 173; scientific interests, 12, 77, 98, 141, 202; statue, 175
 ——, William, 93-94
 ——, William Temple, 93-94
 Franklin College, 176
 Franklin Field, 316-17, 344, 355
 Franklin Institute, 223, 238, 240
 Fraternities, 408, 432
 Fraternity houses, 380, 432
 Frazer, John F., 238-40, 246, 263-64
 ——, Persifor (General), 238
 ——, Persifor (Professor), 335
 Free Library, 332
 Free Museum of Science and Art, 319-20, 332, 352
 Free School, *see* Charity School
 Freedom of speech, 367-71, 404
 Freemasons, *see* Masons
 French Ambassador, 137, 139-40
 French and Indian War, 54, 70
 French courses (*see also* Modern languages), 255, 264, 431
 French Department of Education, 142
 French Legion of Honor, 361
 French Royal Society of Surgery, 99
 French settlers in Philadelphia, 4
 Friars, 432
 Friends, *see* Quakers
 Fullerton, George S. (Vice-Provost 1894-1898), 297, 319, 336-37, 361
 Fund, University, *see* University Fund
 Furness, Horace Howard, Sr., 259, 265, 329-32, 334, 386
 ——, Horace Howard, Jr., 324
 ——, William H., 308
 Gallatin, Albert, 227
 Galloway, Joseph, 113

INDEX

Gamble, Archibald, 134
 Garrick, David, 65, 92
 Garrick Club, 431
 Gates, Horatio, 139
 —, Thomas S. (President 1930-): background, 294, 419; cooperation with other institutions, 428; election to Presidency, 390, 420; expansion policy, 404, 428-29; financial problems, 422; Gates Plan, 423-24; Morris Arboretum, 430; Philadelphia Advisory Finance Commission, 426; religious interests, 433; Trustee, 419
 —, Mrs. Thomas S., 433
 Gates Plan, 423-24
 Gayienquitigoa, Jonathan and Philip, 40
Gazette, 82, 89, 106
 General Alumni Society (*see also* Alumni Society), 321-22, 370, 383-84, 388, 390, 396-97, 399
 General Committee of the Fund, 399
 General Counsel of the University, 414
 General Electric Company, 411
General Magazine and Historical Chronicle, v
 Geneva College, 245
 Genth, Frederick A., 264, 361
 Geography, 31, 81-82, 93, 134, 161, 168-69
 Geology, 205, 225, 239-41, 272, 428
 George II (King), 91, 166
 George III (King), 63-64, 91, 98, 108, 111-12, 148, 170
 George IV (King), 64
 Georgia, University of, 177
 German courses (*see also* Modern languages), 132-34, 168, 183, 255, 264, 431
 German influence, 296, 328, 354
 German Lutheran Church, 142, 159
 German Reformed Church, 5, 21
 German School, 133-34, 153
 German settlers in Pennsylvania, 4, 8, 13, 21, 26, 40, 62, 105, 133, 176, 183-84, 360
 Germantown Academy, 77
 Germantown Cricket Club, 313
 Gest, John B., 232
 Gettysburg, Battle of, 251
 Gettysburg College, 361
 Geyelin, Henry Laussat, 315
 Gilpin, Henry D., 198
 Girard Building, 237
 Girard College, 223
 Girton College, 307
 Gifts: Academy, 30, 36-37, 39, 43, 61, 171, 173; College, 58-59, 61-71, 144, 161, 180, 258, 278; University, 264, 275, 277, 279, 281, 285, 287, 288, 299-303, 305, 307-10, 315, 319-20, 325-27, 337, 339, 341-42, 344-45, 349, 352, 354, 356-57, 365, 373-75, 377-78, 396-400, 403, 406-07, 426, 430
 Glasgow, University of, 80, 91
 Glee Club, 432
 Godfrey, Thomas (mathematician), 79
 —, Thomas (playwright), 93
 —, Thomas (schoolmaster), 14
 Goodspeed, Arthur W., 297
 Goodwin, Daniel R. (Provost 1860-1868), 257, 260
 Göttingen, University of, 202, 361
 Government, Institute of Local and State, 426
 Governor-General of the Philippines, 389-90
 Governor of Pennsylvania: (province), 8, 9, 11, 31, 37, 39, 40, 43, 85, 88, 105, 107-08; (state), 160, 164-66, 181, 286, 329, 372, 376-77, 401, 417, 420
 Governor's Party, 105
 Gowen, Franklin B., 410
 Gowen Memorial Fellowships, 410
 Graduate Education and Research, Board of, 417
 Graduate Hospital, 428
 Graduate House, 355
 Graduate School of Arts and Science: administration, 297, 412, 416-17, 420; alumni, 368; archaeological interests, 350; Bishop Potter's plan, 244-49; degrees, 298, 302, 409; enrollment, 297-98, 358, 382; Faculty, 296-98, 308, 338-39, 358; fellowships and scholarships, 299; founding, 296-97, 303, 336, 409; German influence, 296; Harrison Foundation, 299, 337-39, 352; research survey, 412-13; separation from teachers' courses, 402; sociology courses, 401; summer courses, 347, 401; women students, 298, 303, 308, 401
 Graduate School of Medicine, 382, 409, 428-29
 Graduate School for Women, 298, 303-09, 351, 358, 400
 Grammar School, *see* Latin School
 Grants, *see* Gifts and State support
 Graphic arts, 405
 Graves, Frank Pierrepont, 402, 406
 Graydon, Alexander, 73, 75, 94

"Great Awakening," 96
 Greek (*see also* Classics), 31, 80, 82, 84, 93, 134-35, 167, 172, 187, 224, 244, 267, 322, 366
 Greek-letter societies, 380, 408, 432
 Greenhouses, 206, 302
 Greenman, M. J., 357
 Greenstone buildings, 263, 311
 Grew, Theophilus, 14, 79
 Griffitts, Samuel Powel, 156, 166, 211
Gustavus Vasa, 138-39
 Gymnasium, 264, 313, 316-17, 320, 334, 355, 424
 Gymnastics, 313, 316

Hale, Charles R., 248
 Hall, David, 44, 106
 Halle, University of, 133, 241
 Hamilton, James, 11, 31, 85, 88
 ——, William, 88
 Hamilton family, 261
 Hand in Hand Fire Company, 169
 Harding, Warren G., 889
 Hardwick, Gordon, 423
 Hare, Charles Willing, 234
 ——, J. I. Clarke, 237
 ——, Robert, 155, 215, 284
 Harrisburg Extension Courses, 348
 Harrison, Charles Custis (Provost 1894-1910): Acting Provost, 335-36; action on date of founding, 50-51; background, 335; Botanic Garden, 480; builder, 333-34, 337, 339-45, 355-58, 364; business administration, 336, 359, 371, 375, 379; contributor, 299, 335, 337-39, 374; devotion to work, 336; "education for leadership," 391; election as Provost, 334-36; enrollment increase, 381; fund-raiser, 335, 340-41, 344, 355, 362, 372-76, 378; Harrison Foundation, 299, 337-39, 352; Harrison Laboratory of Chemistry, 339; interest in student life, 340; interest in Veterinary School, 310; Museum interests, 352, 374; reliance on Edgar Fahs Smith, 361; resignation, 336, 348, 352, 356, 358; testimonial dinner, 358; Trustee, 328-29, 334-35
 Harrison, Mrs. Charles Custis, 374
 ——, John, 339
 ——, William Henry, 208
 Harrison Foundation, 299, 337-39, 352
 Harrison (George L. and Emily Michael) Foundation, 429
 Harrison Laboratory of Chemistry, 339
 Hartranft, Chester D., 250, 266
 Harvard, John, 27, 46
 Harvard University, 34, 46, 60, 85, 117, 123, 164, 177, 179, 191-92, 219, 233-34, 239, 262, 277, 279, 285, 303, 309, 316
 Hatfield, H. R., 378
 Haverford College, 313
 Hayes, Richard S., 250
 Hays, William Charles, 341
 Hazard, Samuel, 24
 Hearst, Phoebe, 332
 Hebrew courses (*see also* Oriental languages), 134, 350
 Heffernan, John, 78, 131
 Helmuth, Justus H. C., 133
 Hewson, Thomas G., 205
 ——, William, 97
 Hilprecht, Hermann V., 350
 Histology, 275
 Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vii, 39, 89
 History courses, 31, 84, 134, 161, 169, 231-32, 242-44, 259, 264, 277, 290, 292, 298, 304, 324, 345
 History of art, 425
History of the People of the United States, 290
History of the University of Pennsylvania to 1770, vii, 30, 39, 61
 Hobart College, 200, 227
 Holidays, 187-88, 346
 Holwell, Frances, 38
 Honor societies, 432
 Honorary degrees, *see* Degrees
 Hood, Esther Gowen, 410
 Hoover, Herbert, 411
 Hopkins University, The Johns, 273, 326
 Hopkinson, Francis, 39, 74, 90-93, 96, 115, 130, 159
 ——, Thomas (Trustee), 19, 95
 ——, Thomas (A.B. 1766), 90
 Horner Collection, 357
 Horticulture, *see* Botany
 Hosack, David, 210
 Hospital, *see* University Hospital
 Hospital mergers, 428-29
 Hospital of the Graduate School of Medicine, 428
 Houston, Henry Howard, 341-42, 374
 ——, Howard, 342
 ——, Samuel F., 294, 321
 Houston Club, 342
 Houston Hall, 334, 340-42, 355
 How, S. B., 199

INDEX

Howard Hospital, 428
 Howell, John, 24
 Hughes's billiard parlor, 314
 Hulme, "Billy," 378
 Humane Society, 143, 405
 Humboldt, Alexander, Baron von, 249
 Hunt, Isaac, 113-14
 —, Leigh, 114
 Hunter, John and William, 97
 Hutchinson, James, 136, 166, 208, 213
 —, Sydney E., 424
 Hutchinson Gymnasium, 424
 Huxley, Thomas Henry, 368
 Hydraulics, 168
 Hydrostatics, 168
 Hyems, Mrs., 305
 Hygiene, 272, 325-26
 Hygiene, Department of, 325-26

Idea of an English School, 29, 41, 42, 76, 81
 Illinois, University of, 289, 294, 311, 391
 Illman, Adelaide T., 406
 Illman-Carter Unit for Kindergarten and Primary Teachers, 406
 Incorporation of the University, 164-65
 Independence Hall, *see* State House
 Independence Square, 152
 Indian King Tavern, 7
 Indians, 7, 25, 40, 105
 Industrial education, 239-42, 254-56, 261
 Industrial research, 410-13
 Industry courses, 295
 Infirmary, 424
 Ingersoll, J. R., 189, 239, 257
 Inglis, John, 63
 Inman, Henry, 243
 Institute of Local and State Government, 426
 Instrumental philosophy, 83
 Insurance courses, 295
 Intercollegiate athletics, 423-24
 Interfraternity Agreement, 433
 Interior decoration, 425
 Irvine Auditorium, 342
 Italian courses, 255

Jackson, Francis A., 244, 250
 James, Edmund J., 289, 291, 293-94, 297
 —, Thomas C., 208, 212, 215
 Janitor, 207, 211, 241, 268
 Jastrow, Morris, Jr., 323, 350
 Jay, James, 63-66
 Jayne, Henry LaBarre, 294, 374
 Jayne, Horace, 300-01, 328, 351, 357, 365
 Jefferson, Thomas, 202-03, 210, 214-15, 233
 Jefferson Medical College, 207, 216, 271
 Jersey College, *see* Princeton University
 Johns Hopkins University, The, 273, 326
 Johnson, Eldridge Reeves, 429
 —, Samuel, 40, 42, 81, 132, 173
 Johnson Foundation for Research in Medical Physics, 429
 Jones, Griffith, 23
 —, Huntingdon, 248
Journal, The, 106, 110
Journal of the Franklin Institute, 238
 Journalism, 431
 Judicial recall, 368
 Junior Law Society, 143, 157-58
 Junto, 7, 12, 29, 30, 143
 Junto, 431

Kane, Elisha Kent, 343
 Kansas, University of, 391
 Keble, John, 195
 Keble Fund, 195
 Keble School, 195
 Keen, Gregory B., 323
 Kendall, Ezra Otis, 240-41, 264, 297
 Kew Gardens, 430
 Kilgore, Caroline B., 305
 Kindergarten Unit, 406
 King George II, III, and IV, *see* George II, III, and IV
 King's College, *see* Columbia University
 Kinnersley, Ebenezer, 12, 55, 77-79, 109-10, 123, 144, 171, 173, 202
 —, Mrs. Ebenezer, 56, 58, 78
 Kuhn, Adam, 101, 156, 166, 202, 208
 Kunze, John D., 130, 133-34

Laboratories, 161, 212, 214, 229, 269-70, 275-76, 301-02, 325-28, 333-34, 339, 354, 356, 397, 411
 Labor research, 410
 Laboratory of Chemistry, 339, 355
 — Clinical Medicine, 325, 327-28, 337, 409, 429
 — Hygiene, 326
 — Psychology, 354
 Laird, Warren Powers, 312, 341
 Lamb, Andrew, 14
 Lamberton, William H., 297
 Land grant colleges, 253-56, 372, 427
 Land grants from city, 262, 352, 428

Landis, Charles K., 302
 Landscape architecture, 425
 Languages, *see* Classics, French, German, Hebrew, Greek, Italian, Latin, Modern languages, Oriental languages
Lantern, 431
 Latin (*see also* Classics), 31, 58, 73-75, 80, 82, 84, 86, 93, 103, 134-35, 161, 167, 172, 187, 224, 244, 366
 Latin, use of, 85-87, 89-90, 103, 109, 157, 161, 200
 Latin School, 44, 72-76, 78-80, 82, 90, 113, 121, 131, 134-35, 142, 153-54, 169
 Latta, James, 80
 Law, School of: administration, 236, 264, 365, 367, 416-17; admission of women, 305, 400; alumni, 236, 419; degrees, 236, 410; enrollment, 236, 259, 382; Faculty, 91, 158, 205, 234-37, 367-68; first attempts, 157-59, 163, 231, 233-34; graduate courses, 382, 410; *Law Review*, 431; location and buildings, 236-37, 265, 320, 334, 355; permanent establishment, 232, 235-37, 310; prelaw courses, 382
 Law of 1779, *see* Act of 1779
 Law Building, 334
Law Review, 431
 Law Society, 143, 157-58
 Lawrence, Thomas L., 36
 Lawrence Scientific School, 233
 Lea, George, 37
 —, Henry C., 324-25
 Lea Library of Medieval History, 324
 "Leadership training," 384-87, 391
 Leave of absence, 302
 Legion of Honor, 361
 Legislature (Pennsylvania), 28, 89, 117, 120-25, 130-31, 144-45, 147-51, 153, 159-61, 163-64, 172, 181, 183-84, 200, 203-05, 207, 209, 214, 226, 254-56, 278, 305, 352, 362, 369, 372, 376-77, 379; (Provincial) *see* Assembly
 Lehigh University, 244, 252, 277
 Leidy, Joseph, 268, 300-01, 318, 351
 Leipzig, University of, 354
 Length of course, 82, 84-85, 186, 194, 216, 259, 269-75, 290, 302, 325, 346
 Lesley, J. Peter, 241, 264
 Leyden, University of, 97, 99
 Liberal Arts, Board of, 417
 Liberal Arts for Women, College of, 408, 407-08, 425
 Librarian, v, 323, 350, 414
 Libraries (Philadelphia), 11, 12, 29, 34, 155, 332, 427-28
 Library, University, vii, 81, 84, 142, 161, 264, 273, 274, 308, 322-24, 330, 337, 351, 373, 376, 397, 416-17, 420
 Life Trustees, 417, 420
 Lightning rods, 77
 Lincoln, Abraham, 200, 251
 Lindsay, Samuel McCune, 294
 Linnæan Society, 205
 Linnæus, 101, 204
 Lippincott, Horace M., v, viii
 —, J. B., 309-10
 Literary societies, 187, 196-99, 231, 248-49, 265, 431-32
 Literature courses, 243-44, 249, 257, 259, 264, 277, 292, 345
 Little Quad, 344
 Livingston, Robert R., 204
 Local alumni groups, 322, 384, 392
 Local and State Government, Institute of, 426
 "Lodge in Lodge Alley," 152
 Logan, James, 11, 12, 34, 165
 Logan Hall, 269, 273
 Logic, 43, 80, 83, 134, 169, 196
 London Tavern, 8
 Lotteries, 36, 54, 55, 60, 61, 65, 66, 78, 110-11, 122, 143, 145, 398
 Loudon, Lord, 88
 Louis XVI (King), 141
 Louvain, University of, 150
 Loxley house, 4, 21
 Low, Seth, 335
 Ludlow, John (Provost 1834-1853), 227, 232, 243
 Lutherans, 5, 130, 133, 142, 159
 Macfarlane, John M., 301, 303, 430
 McAllister, John, Jr., 196
 —, Thomas Hamilton, 196
 McCall, Peter, 236, 262
 McClellan, George B., 252
 —, William, 383
 McClelland, George W. (Vice-Provost 1925-1931, Vice-President 1931-1939, Provost 1939-), 387, 415-16, 421
 McClung, Clarence E., 412
 McCosh, James, 277
 McDowell, John (Provost 1806-1810), 186, 257
 McElroy, John G. R., 264, 289, 335
 McKean, Thomas, 130
 McKean Dormitory, 344
 McKeehan, Charles Louis, viii

INDEX

McKenzie, R. Tait, 317, 358
 McKinley, William, 361
 McMaster, John Bach, viii, 49, 289-90,
 358
 Madeira, Louis C., 321
 Magaw, Samuel (Vice-Provost 1782-
 1791), 40, 134, 140, 145, 167
 Maloney Memorial Clinic, 318, 328
 Manor of Perkasie, 69-71, 161
 Manufactures, Society for the Encour-
 agement of, 143
 Marbois, François Barbé de, 139-40
 Marine biology, 302
 Martin, Josiah, 39, 42, 83-84, 96
 ——, William, 42, 83-84, 96
 Mask and Wig, 344, 397, 431
 Mason, James M., 198
 ——, Richard S., 200
 Masons, 8, 28, 30, 152, 169, 229, 323
 Mass education, 384-87, 391, 395
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
 311
 Materia medica, 101-02, 201-02, 213
 Mathematical School, 72, 78-79, 121, 131,
 153-54
 Mathematics, 31, 37, 58, 73, 78-79, 82-85,
 93, 103, 112, 134, 153-54, 168-69, 193,
 220-22, 259, 264-65
 Mather, William, 39
 Matlack, Timothy, 124, 130
 Mayor of Philadelphia, 10, 36
 Mechanics, 168, 240, 254-55
 Medals, 114-15, 187
 Medary, Milton Bennett, 341
 Medical Affairs, Board of, 417
 Medical Alumni Society, 273, 320
 Medical apprentices, 211
 Medical Building: Ninth Street, 206;
 West Philadelphia, 268-70, 273-75
 Medical jurisprudence, 272
 Medical Laboratory, 356, 376
 Medical Reserve Corps, 380
Medical Review, 431
 Medical Society, 142
 Medicine, School of: administration,
 178, 214, 260, 264, 279, 365, 367, 416-
 17; admission of women, 305-06, 400;
 Alumni Society, 273; anatomy, 101,
 136, 182, 205, 213-14, 300; animal
 pathology, 427; Auxiliary School, 272-
 73, 296, 300, 304, 346, 430; clinical
 teaching, 102, 136, 212, 327-28; Com-
 mencements, 103, 136, 157, 159, 229;
 crowding, 212-14; degrees, 103, 136-37,
 156-57, 208-09, 216, 229; Dental School
 sponsorship, 267-71; Department of
 Hygiene, 325-26; dissection, 100-01,
 212; enrollment, 103-04, 121, 137, 157,
 160, 208-09, 212, 228, 259, 271, 358,
 382; Faculty, 100-02, 131, 136, 166, 182,
 202-05, 208-16, 260, 268, 272, 279, 305-
 06, 316, 358, 365, 409; fee system, 167,
 204, 206, 210-12, 214-15, 228, 270, 272,
 274-75, 279; fixed salary policy, 270,
 274-75; founding, 68, 89, 96-104, 233,
 259, 289, 301; fund raising, 278;
 growth, 207-16, 273-76; history, v, vi;
 Hospital (*see* University Hospital),
 mergers, 428-29; instruction methods,
 269, 274; length of course, 269-75,
 325, 346; location and buildings, 180,
 182, 212-15, 228-30, 261-63, 260-70,
 273-75, 327-28, 356, 376; *Medical Re-
 view*, 431; minutes, vii, 214; Pepper
 Clinical Laboratory, 325-28, 337, 409;
 postgraduate work, 275-76, 382, 409,
 428-29; premedical courses, 382, 386;
 reorganization after 1779, 135-37, 156-
 57, 214; reorganization 1875-1878,
 274-76; research, 378, 409, 429; salary
 guarantee fund, 270, 275; union of
 1791, 166; war service, 119, 135, 250,
 380; yellow fever epidemics, 207-08,
 213
 Medicine, Theory and Practice of, 89,
 136, 202
 Medico-Chirurgical College, 428
 Meeker, George H., 409
 Meigs, Montgomery C., 253
 Memorial Tower and Gateway, 344, 355
 Mennonites, 13
 Mercer, E. LeRoy, 423
 Meredith, William, 200
 Merion Cricket Club, 313
 Merriam, John Campbell, 411
 Merrick, John Vaughan, 340
 Metaphysics, 80, 83, 85, 134, 169
 Methodists, 22, 65
 Michigan, University of, 391
 Microscopy, 275, 301
 Middle Temple, 91
 Midwifery, 136, 213
 Miel, Charles J., v
 Mifflin, Thomas, 115, 118, 148, 160, 165,
 181
 Miles, Nelson A., 344
 Military Arts and Tactics, Department
 of, 249, 252, 255, 379
 Military occupation, 115-17
 Military training, 249-55, 379-81, 390

Miller, E. Spencer, 286
 —, William Otto, 395
 Mills, Charles K., 358
 —, Hugh, 14
 Mineralogy, 205, 212, 225, 240, 272, 428
 Mines, Arts, and Manufactures, School of, 237-42, 254
 Mining, 239-41
 Minister of France, 137, 139-40
 Mint, United States, 238, 263
 Minute Books, vi, 28, 48, 58, 61, 81, 131-32, 135, 138, 147, 151, 160, 165, 189-90, 193-94, 196, 214, 237, 240
Mirania, College of, 42, 44, 81
 Mitchell, E. Coppée, 237
 Mitchell, S. Weir, 4, 287
 Modern languages (*see also* French, German, Italian), 72, 232, 264, 277, 366
 Mohawk Indians, 40
 Montgomery, Thomas Harrison, viii, 30, 39, 61
 —, William W., 250
 Montour, Andrew, 40
 —, John, 40
 Moore, Alfred Fitler, 425
 —, Mrs. Bloomfield, 299-300, 308
 —, William, 107-08, 130
 Moore School of Electrical Engineering, 425-26
 Moral philosophy, 84, 107, 132, 134, 151, 168, 186, 196, 220-21, 224, 243, 259
 Moral science, 220
 Moravians, 5, 10, 14, 21, 22, 24, 26
 Morgagni, Giovanni Battista, 99
 Morgan, F. Corlies, 423
 Morgan Dormitory, 355
 —, John: Commencement speaker 1765, 89; death, 156; differences with Dr. Shippen, 98, 136; "Discourse Upon the Institution of Medical Schools in America," 100; education and travels, 96-99; essay medal winner, 115; honors abroad, 99; inauguration of Medical School, 99-104, 259; part in Revolution, 119; plan for medical courses, 98; trip to West Indies, 68-69, 95-96, 180
 Morrill Act, 254
 Morris, Effingham B., 314, 357, 427
 —, John, 39
 —, John D., 429
 —, Lydia T., 429
 —, P. Pemberton, 237
 —, Robert, 115, 148, 209
 —, Robert H., 40, 165
 Morris, Samuel C., 119
 Morris Arboretum, 429-31
 Morris Biological Farm, 357
 Morris Dormitory, 355
 Morton, Henry, 248
 —, James St. Clair, 252
 Muhlenberg, John Peter Gabriel, 118, 124
 Muhlenberg College, 361
 Mullen's Tavern, 8
 Mumford, Edward W., v, 294
 Murray, Francis, 138-39
 —, Lindley, 144
 Museum, *see* University Museum
 Museum of Science and Art, 319-20, 332, 352
 Music, 91-92, 142, 265-67, 302-03, 405, 408, 425, 432
 Music, Department of, 266-67, 302-03, 425
 Musical Clubs, 432
 Musser, John Herr, 409, 429
 Musser Department of Research Medicine, 409, 429
 Muybridge, Eadweard, 317-18
 Nashville Medical School, 271
 Nassau Hall, 55
 National Academy of Sciences, 223, 411
 National Bureau of Education, 318
 National Endowment for Research, 411
 National Research Council, 411
 Natural history, 72, 143, 168, 202, 204-05, 207, 238, 300
 Natural philosophy (*see also* Physics), 43, 45, 79, 84, 102-03, 132, 134, 168, 215, 221, 223, 264
 Natural science, 83, 85, 206, 220, 239, 300, 410
 Natural Science, School of, 205-07, 237, 239, 309
 Naval Academy, 244, 249
 Naval Reserve Force, 380
 Navigation, 168
 Nearing, Scott, 369-71
 Nearing case, 367-71
 Negroes, 4, 5, 6, 22
 Neill, Hugh, 122
 "New Building," 23, 25-27, 35-38, 45, 53, 57, 76, 89, 94, 142, 165, 173-74
 Newbold, William R., 297, 299, 358
 Newcastle, Duke of, 65
 Newman, John Henry (Cardinal), 224
 New York Society of the Alumni, 322, 344

INDEX

Ninth Street buildings, 180-82, 187, 197, 206-07, 213-15, 228-30, 236, 261, 303, 314, 343, 430
 Nippur expedition, 350
 Nitzsche, George E., v, viii, 318
 Noble, John, 24
 Non-sectarianism, *see* Religious liberty
 Norris, Isaac, 69, 114-15
 Norriton Estates, 69, 71, 161, 180
 North Carolina, University of, 177
 Northwestern University, 294
 Nuneham College, 307
 Nursing education, 406

Oath of allegiance: British Crown, 44, 105, 122-23, 165; state government, 123, 130-31, 166
 Oberholtzer, Ellis P., viii
 Observatory, 232, 334, 356
 Obstetrics, 215
 Office Manager, 415
 Officers Reserve Corps, 379
 Ohio State University, 402
Old Penn, 378
 Old St. David's Church, 20
 Oliphant, William, 131
 Olivier, Charles P., 356
 Olympics, Cultural, 404-05
 Optics, 168, 195
 Oratory, 83-84, 87, 90, 103, 134, 144, 154, 161, 187, 197, 199, 264, 405
 Orchestra, 432
 Organ, 92, 142
 Oriental languages, 133-34, 168, 323, 350
 Orthopaedic Hospital and Infirmary for Nervous Diseases, 429
 Oxford Group, 433
 Oxford Movement, 224
 Oxford University, 22, 44, 46, 62, 65, 70, 72, 104, 150, 266, 387, 433

Packard, Charles S. W., 321
 —, F. R., vi
 Paine, Thomas, 118, 137
 Paleontology, 351, 428
 Palestra, 424
 Pan American Union, 294
 Parke, John Grubb, 252
 Parliament, 9, 108, 114
 Parsons, James, 237
 Pathology, 275
 Patten, Simon N., 289, 294
 Patterson, C. Stuart, 237, 315
 —, Robert, 79, 133-34, 190, 196, 199

Patterson, Robert M. (Vice-Provost 1814-1828), 193
 Payne, J. Kendrick, 266
 Peale, C. W., 207
 Pedagogy, 401
 Pembroke, John Clifford, 253
 Pender, Harold, 426
 Penmanship, 72, 78-80, 82
 Penn, John, 161
 —, Julian, 63
 —, Richard, 39, 85, 111, 122-23
 —, Thomas, 15, 31, 39, 61-64, 66, 69, 70, 85, 99, 100, 111
 —, William, 3, 4, 9, 24, 70, 111
 Penn Charter School, 13, 14, 94
 Penn family, 61, 69, 70, 104, 105, 109-10, 125, 140, 170
 Penniman, Josiah Harmar (Vice-Provost 1911-1920, President 1923-1926, Provost 1921-1939): Acting Provost, 389; alumni relations, 383, 393; author, viii; background, 363; Dean of the College, 363, 383; election as Provost, 363, 389; encouragement of research, 409, 411-12, 421; President, 390, 415; Provost's House, 398, 415, 419; retirement, 416, 421; scholar, 360, 419; Vice-Provost, 363, 383
 —, Mrs. Josiah H., 398
 Pennsylvania, Province and State of: Assembly (Provincial), 9, 26, 27, 28, 30, 61, 70, 101, 105, 110-12, 114, 171; Attorney-General, 36, 124, 180, 165, 230; Board of Education, 390; Board of Examiners, 305; Chief Justice, 13, 101, 112, 130, 148, 165, 189, 200, 305; Constitution of 1776, 118, 120, 147, 149; Constitution of 1790, 158, 160, 164; Controller-General, 201; Council of Censors, 147-48; Executive Council, 91, 124, 129, 139-40, 165, 231; Governor, 8, 9, 11, 31, 37, 39, 40, 43, 85, 88, 105, 107-08, 160, 164-66, 181, 286, 329, 372, 376-77, 401, 417, 420; Judge of the Admiralty, 130; Legislature, 28, 89, 117, 120-25, 130-31, 144-45, 147-51, 153, 159-61, 163-64, 172, 181, 183-84, 200, 203-05, 207, 209, 214, 226, 254-56, 278, 305, 352, 362, 369, 372, 376-77, 379; Livestock Sanitary Board, 310; President, 137, 139, 159; Provincial Council, 9, 91; Secretary, 130, 165; Superintendent of Instruction, 390; Supreme Court, 184, 305; Treasurer, 165; Vice-President, 130

Pennsylvania Clubs, 394, 396-99
 Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, 361
 Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery, 268
Pennsylvania Gazette, v
 Pennsylvania, Historical Society of, vii, 39, 89
 Pennsylvania Hospital, 97, 99, 102-03, 143, 155, 172, 212
 Pennsylvania Light Artillery, 250
 Pennsylvania Players, 431
 Pennsylvania politics, 104-25, 146-50, 172
 Pennsylvania Railroad, 320, 419
 "Pennsylvania religion," 5
 Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 428
 Pennsylvania State College, 253, 255-56, 390, 426
Pennsylvanian, 363, 431
 "Pennsylvanius," 110-11
 Pennypacker, Samuel W., 50-51, 376
 Pepper, George S., 326
 —, George Wharton, 321, 389, 391-93
 —, William (Provost 1881-1894): achievements, 287-88, 329-30, 333, 364; admission of women, 307-08; alumni relations, 322; archaeological interests, 350-52; biography, 288, 343; death, 332; encouragement of athletics, 315-16; estimate, 328-32; expansion policy, 287-88, 291, 296, 300-01, 309, 312, 322-23, 350, 364, 428; Faculty relations, 292-93, 365; fund raising, 310, 326, 329, 344, 372-74, 379; gifts to University, 325-27, 329, 337, 374; honorary degree, 329; inauguration, 288, 315; medical interests, 287, 324-28; Pepper Laboratory, 325-28, 337, 409, 429; powers, 285-87, 293, 335, 418; qualifications, 287, 328, 336; resignation, 329, 334, 351, 357; statue, 332; support of research, 317-19
 —, Mrs. William, 352, 374
 —, William, Sr., 327
 —, William (Dean, School of Medicine), v, vi
 Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine, 325-28, 337, 409, 429
 Periodicals, vii, 199, 363, 378, 431
 Perkasie Manor, 69-71, 161
 Peters, John P., 350
 —, Rev. Richard, 15, 28, 29, 37-39, 42, 59, 74, 99, 109, 111, 113, 172
 Petition to the Crown, 111-12
 Pettiford, Charles, 430
 Pewter Platter Tavern, 8
 Pharmacy, 275
 Phi Beta Kappa, 363, 432
 Phi Kappa Beta, 432
 Philadelphia, City and County of: Advisory Finance Commission, 426; Board of Health, 182; City Council, 9, 10, 28, 30, 33, 36, 171, 262; Court of Common Pleas, 417; Department of Public Health, 326; District Court, 235; Mayor, 10, 36; Public Schools, 223, 238, 240, 245, 294, 304, 315, 323
 Philadelphia (Colonial): aristocracy, 6, 9, 30; artisans, 6; class distinctions, 6, 9; commerce, 5; crimes and punishments, 8; disorderly houses, 7; education, 13-16, 22, 38; government, 9; intellectual interests, 11-12, 162; merchants, 6-7; music, 10; Negroes, 4, 5, 8; population (1749), 8; poverty, 7; professions, 6; religion, 4-5, 17-27; taverns, 7-8; theatres, 10-11; United States Capital, 138-40, 181; wealth, 6, 7, 9
 Philadelphia Agricultural Society, 143, 309
 Philadelphia Award, 419
 Philadelphia City Committee, 118
 Philadelphia Coaching Club, 240
 Philadelphia College of Physicians, 203
 Philadelphia *Gazette*, 82, 89, 106
 Philadelphia High School, 238, 240, 245, 294, 323
 Philadelphia Law Association, 234-35
 Philadelphia Orchestra, 266, 419
 Philippines, Governor-General, 389-90
 Philological Society, 197-98
 Philomathean Society, vii, 187, 197-99, 223, 231, 248-49, 265, 363, 431-32
 "Philosophical experiments," 12, 58, 229
 Philosophical School, 71-73, 96, 136
 Philosophical Society, *see* American Philosophical Society
 Philosophy (*see also* Experimental, Instrumental, Moral, and Natural philosophy), 37, 43, 73, 153, 259, 296-98, 301, 319, 336, 353, 400-01
 Phipps, Henry, 357, 409
 Phipps Institute, 357, 409
 Photography, 317-18
 Physical culture, *see* Athletics
 Physical education (*see also* Athletics), 316-17, 358, 379, 423-24

Physical Education, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Student Health, Department of, 423-24

Physical examinations, 424

Physical science, 205

Physick, Philip Syng, 208, 212, 214

Physick, Theory and Practice of, 100

Physics (*see also* Natural philosophy), 83-85, 168, 263, 298, 304, 410, 429

Physiology, 136, 213, 275

Physiology Laboratory, 334

Pilling Garden, 430

Pitt, William, 63, 65

Pittsburgh, University of, 177, 233, 390

Pittsburgh alumni, 322

Placement Service, 415

Plain Truth, 7

Plastic arts, 405

Players, 431

Plays, 87, 92-93, 138-39, 267, 322, 405, 408, 431-32

Plumsted, William, 10, 11, 13

Pneumatics, 168, 195

Poetry, 89

Policy Committee, 388, 390-92

Political involvement, 104-25, 129-32, 135, 146-50

Political science, 289, 294

Polk, James K., 199, 200

Polyclinic Hospital, 428

Popular Party, 105, 112

Portuguese Consul, 207

Postgraduate study, 244-49, 275-76, 296-99, 302, 308, 327, 337-39, 347, 401, 409-13, 419-20, 426, 428

Potter, Alonzo, 244-48

Potts, John, 37

———, Jonathan, 103, 119

Powell, Samuel, 63, 98

Practical agriculture, 254

Practical arts, 254

Practice School, 406

Predental course, 382, 386

Prelaw course, 382

Premedical course, 382, 386

Presbyterians, 5, 13, 14, 16, 21, 25, 26, 32, 35, 47, 80, 90, 97, 98, 106, 112, 122-23, 130, 132, 142, 166, 176-77, 293

"President's House," 180-82, 187, 197-98, 201, 213-14, 228, 372

President, need of, 177, 193, 278-79, 281-82, 285, 418

President of the Continental Congress, 137, 139

President of the United States, 159, 181, 199, 200, 202, 208, 251, 361, 389

Presidents, List of, 436

Press, 415

Preventive medicine, 325

Prevost, Harriet C., 378

Price, Eli Kirk, Jr., 281

———, George, 38

———, Jonathan, 24

———, Mary Chandler, 24

———, William, 24

Priestley, Joseph, 213

Primary teachers' training, 406

Prince of Parthia, The, 93

Princeton University, 16, 34, 40, 47, 51, 54, 55, 60, 80, 85-86, 90, 91, 92-93, 97, 98, 101-02, 108, 130, 133, 164, 176-77, 179, 186, 191-92, 196, 241, 245, 262, 277, 285, 290, 297, 395, 415

Privy Council, 63-64, 108

Prizes, 58, 114-15, 187, 340-41

Proceedings of Schoolmen's Week, 404

Professionalism, 424

Property Committee, 374

Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania, 15, 29-34, 41, 54, 81, 94, 173, 180, 395, 434

Proprietary charters, *see* Charters

Proprietary Party, 67, 105, 106, 170

Proprietors of Pennsylvania, 6, 9-11, 15, 16, 31, 39, 41, 43, 58, 62, 64, 66, 67, 104-05, 109-11, 113

Provincial Assembly, *see* Assembly

Provincial Council, 9, 91

Provost, concept of, 43-44, 163, 177-78, 279, 285-87, 293, 335, 360, 374, 414-18, 420

Provost Smith Dormitory, 344

Provost's House: Fourth Street, 56-57, 132, 147, 151, 181, 397; West Philadelphia, 389, 397-98, 415, 419

Provosts, List of, 435

Provosts' Tower, 355

Psi Upsilon, 432

Psychological Clinic, 353-55, 401

Psychology, 353-55

Public examinations, 75, 86, 88, 103, 184

Public health agencies, 182, 326

Public schools (Philadelphia), 223, 238, 240, 245, 294, 304, 315, 323

Public utilities, 368

Publications: official, vii, 368, 374, 378, 404, 415, 422; student, vii, 199, 363, 378, 431

Publicity Manager, 415
Punch Bowl, 431
 Purchasing Agent, 414-15

Quads, 344
 Quakers, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 21, 25, 32, 65, 105, 130, 176-77, 375
 Quarter Sessions Court, 8
 Quinn, Arthur H., 11, 92, 347, 366, 433

Radicalism, 367-71
 Rafinesque, C. R., 204
 Radcliffe College, 309
 Rawle, William, 189
 —, William Brooke, 251
 Read, James, 24, 27
 —, John Meredith, 200
 Reading Extension Courses, 348
 Real estate courses, 286, 295
 Recorder of the University, v
 Rector (Academy), 31, 37, 42, 43, 44
 Red and blue, 314-15, 348
Red and Blue, 431
 Redding, William A., 321, 383
 Redman, John R., 97, 102
 Reed, Henry, 321
 —, Henry Hope, 223-24, 230-31, 242-44, 246, 290
 —, Joseph, 91, 120-21, 129, 132, 231
 —, William B., 230-32, 235, 242, 290
 Relay races, 317
 Religious composition of Philadelphia, 4-5
 Religious interests, 340, 342, 433
 Religious liberty, 32-33, 35-36, 66, 85, 122-24, 130, 172, 176-77, 225, 368, 433
 Removal of Faculty members, 76-77, 291-94, 368-71
 Remuneration of Faculty, 31, 43, 58, 131, 144-46, 162, 185, 225, 239, 242, 266, 270, 272, 277, 279, 401
 Research, 246-49, 296-99, 301-02, 319, 327-28, 337-39, 352, 355, 357, 407, 409-13, 416-17, 421-22, 426-30
 Research, Committee on, 339
 Research Medicine, Department of, 409
 Reserve Officers Training Corps, 379, 381
 Revolutionary War, vii, 33, 45, 54, 59, 74, 79, 89, 90, 98, 103, 114-18, 125, 129-30, 135, 137-39, 148, 151, 164-65, 170, 179, 212, 214, 231, 238, 249-50, 253, 379
 Rhetoric, 31, 43, 84, 168-69, 224, 264

Richards, Alfred Newton (Vice-President 1939-), 416
 —, Thomas W., 263-64, 311-12
Rights of Man, The, 137
 Rittenhouse, David (Vice-Provost 1780-1782), 78-79, 124, 132-34, 141
 River Fields, 424
 Roberdeau, Daniel, 106
 Roberts', Mrs., Coffee House, 8, 35, 165, 173
 Robeson, Thomas, 69
 Robinette, Edward B., 429
 Robinette Foundation for Study and Treatment of Circulatory Diseases, 429
 Rochambeau, Jean Baptiste D. de V., Comte de, 141
 Rockefeller Foundation, 410, 412
 Rodney Dormitory, 355
 Rogers, Fairman, 240-41, 274
 —, Henry D., 225
 Roman Catholics, 5, 10, 105, 124, 130, 183, 224
 Roper's Gymnasium, 313
 Rosengarten, J. G., 374, 378
 Rosenwald Foundation, 410
 Rosetta Stone, 248-49
 Rothrock, Joseph T., 301, 430
 "Rowbottom," 344
 Rowe, Leo S., 294
 Rowing, 94, 314
 Royal brief, 63-66
 Royal Society, 99
 Royalists, *see* Tories
 Ruby, George W., 361
 Running (*see also* Track athletics), 94
 Rural economy, 205
 Rush, Benjamin, 102, 136, 156, 166, 203, 208, 211, 213-15, 309
 Rutgers University, 193, 222, 266
 Rutledge, Edward, 220
 Ryder, John, 301

Sabbatical leave, 302
 Sadtler, Samuel P., 361
 Sailing, 94
 St. Andrews University, 91
 St. John's College, 186
 St. Paul's Church, 134
 St. Peter's Church, 10, 60, 219
 Sanitary Fair, 257
 Sargeant, John, 189
 Sargent, Dudley A., 316
 —, John, 114
 Sargent Essay Medals, 114-15

Saturday courses, 345, 347, 353, 378, 384, 401
 Say, Thomas, 207, 237
Scheme of a Liberal Education, The, 81-85
 Scholarships, fellowships, and student aid, 36, 279, 299, 304-05, 308, 315, 337, 349, 374; 378, 400, 410, 412
 Scholasticism, 85-87, 172
 "School," concept of, 72
 School of —, *see* Animal Pathology; Architecture, Biology, Dentistry, Education, Fine Arts, Finance and Economy; Law; Liberal Arts, Medicine, Mines, Arts, and Manufactures; Social Work, Veterinary Medicine
 Schoolmen's Week, 378, 403-04
 Science (*see also* Natural science, Scientific School, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Engineering, Physics), 83, 173, 201-07, 231, 237-42, 254-56, 264-65, 277, 300-03, 319, 352, 410, 428
 Scientific agriculture, 254
 Scientific experiments, 12
 Scientific School: administration, 264, 365; admission of women, 304; architectural courses, 265, 311; certificates of proficiency, 241, 348; College of Agriculture, Mines, Manufactures, and the Mechanic Arts, 254-56, 261, 264; Constituent Board, 417; degrees, 232, 298; endowment by John Henry Towne, 264, 277; engineering courses, 239-42, 254, 425; enrollment, 206, 241; Faculty, 205-07, 237-41, 254, 264, 297, 339; "Faculty of Physical Science and Rural Economy," 205-07; graduate courses, 339; location, 206, 254, 265; reorganization in 1869, 263-65, 277-79; School of Mines, Arts, and Manufactures, 232, 237-42, 254
 Scotch-Irish settlers in Philadelphia, 4
 Scranton Extension Courses, 348
 Scull, Nicholas, 5
 Seal of the University, 50, 51, 131-32
 Searl, James, 124
 Second Presbyterian Church, 60
 Secretary of Commerce (U.S.), 411
 — the Treasury (U.S.), 199, 200, 232
 — the University, v, vi, vii, 194-95, 211, 335, 414-15
 — War (U.S.), 389
 Secularism, *see* Religious liberty
 Seidensticker, Oswald, 264
 Sellers, William, 263
 Seminars, 297, 308, 338
 Semitics, *see* Oriental languages
 Sergeant Hall, 403
 Seward, William, 24
 Seybert, Henry, 319
 Seybert Chair of Philosophy, 319
 Seybert Commission, 319, 336
 Shakespeare Library, 324
 Sharswood, George, 235-36
 Shiba, Shiro, 294
 Shippen, Edward, 101, 159
 —, Nancy, 139
 —, William, Jr. (1736-1808): death, 214-15; differences with Dr. Morgan, 98; education, 98, 101; election to College Medical Faculty, 101; part in Revolution, 119; pioneer anatomy courses, 98-100; plan for medical courses, 98; retention by restored College, 156; retention by University of Pennsylvania, 166, 208, 212-15; retention by the University of the State of Pennsylvania, 136; Trustee of the University of the State of Pennsylvania, 124
 Shippen, William, Sr., 13, 98, 101
 Shippen houses, 4, 98, 101, 214
 Sigma Xi, 410, 432
 Silliman, Benjamin, 210, 213
 Sims, John C., vii, 320
 Sinkler, Wharton, 321
 Skating, 94
 Slaves in Colonial Philadelphia, 4, 6, 8
 Smith, Adam, 59
 —, Charles, 157-58
 —, Edgar Fahs (Vice-Provost 1898-1910, Provost 1910-1920): alumni relationships, 362, 385; background, 360-61; characteristics, 360-61, 397-98, 415; chemical work, 339, 346, 361-62; division of schools, 365; "education for leadership," 385-87; election as Provost, 361-62; fund raising, 362, 376-78, 402; Nearing case, 369-71; political connections, 361-62, 371, 376-77; resignation, 362-63, 388-89; Vice-Provost, 361; writer, 361
 —, Mrs. Edgar Fahs, 397
 —, John Augustus, 227
 —, William (Provost 1754-1779): Anglican connections, 61-62, 80, 105, 114, 122-23, 130, 149, 170, 172, 183; attitude toward Revolution, 119-20,

170; background, 41; chosen first
 Provost, 44, 173; *College of Mirania*, 42, 44; conflict with the University of the State of Pennsylvania, 131-32, 139, 146-50; *Discourses*, 62, 82; dominant influence, 72-73, 80, 172, 178, 285; end of reign, 125, 132, 146, 162, 167-68; estimate, 169-70; financial accounts, 132, 147, 167; founding of Washington College, 149, 157, 177; fund raising, 56, 59, 61-68, 132, 168, 171, 278; memoir by Provost Stillé, 282; pension, 132, 167; poet, 89; political activities, 104-25; Provost's House, 56-57, 132, 147, 151, 168; recommendation for new charter, 43; relations with Franklin, 41-43, 109-10, 113, 155, 173; report to Legislature (1779), 121-22; restoration, 129, 146-52; salary, 43, 56, 58; *The Scheme of a Liberal Education*, 81-85; showman, 87-88, 91-92; speculation in western lands, 149, 168; student relationships, 72, 93, 95-96; teacher, 43, 72-73, 79, 102, 202; trip to Charleston, 67-69; trips to England, 61-67, 69, 98, 108-10, 112, 132, 168, 170-71
 ——, Mrs. William, 62, 108
 Smith, Provost, Dormitory, 344
 Smith, E. F., Memorial Library, vii, 361
 Smithsonian Institution, 223
 Soccer, 424
 Social sciences (*see also* Sociology), 84-85, 289
 Social Work, School of, 428
 Society for Promoting Psalmody, 142
 —— the Encouragement of Manufactures, 143
 —— the Extension of University Teaching, 354
 —— the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 22, 40
 —— the Propagation of the Gospel, 20, 61, 62, 183
 —— of the Alumni, *see* Alumni Society
 Sociology (*see also* Social sciences), 294, 401, 407
 Sorer's Tavern, 314
 Soule, Phelps, 415
 Sources of history, v-viii
 South, students from, 199, 209, 250, 252, 272
 South Carolina, University of, 177
 Spanish settlers in Philadelphia, 4
 Spanish-American War, 344
 Spelman, Laura, Foundation, 410
 Sphinx, 432
 Spiritualism, 319
 Sports, *see* Athletics
 Stabler, W. Brooke, 433
 Stamp Act, 90, 115, 118
 State Agricultural Association, 255
 State Government, Institute of Local and, 426
 State Board of Education, 390
 State College, 253, 255-56, 390, 426
 State Constitution: (1776), 118, 120, 147, 149; (1790), 158, 160, 164
 State House, 12, 34, 100, 131, 149, 153, 163, 165-66
 State Livestock Sanitary Board, 310
 State support, 120, 123, 125, 131, 144, 146, 160-64, 182-84, 200, 203-05, 256, 278, 310, 329, 349, 352, 355, 362, 369, 371-73, 375-79, 384-85, 390-94, 398, 402, 427
 State University, concept of, 68, 120, 124, 129-31, 133, 146, 149, 160-61, 164, 166, 177, 391-92
 Statistics courses, 295
 Statutes of the University (*see also* By-laws), 291, 321, 414, 416-17, 420
 Steamboat experiments, 134
 Stedman, Alexander, 54, 75
 Stengel, Alfred (Vice-President 1931-1939), 326, 328, 416
 Stenton mansion, 4
 Stevens, William Bacon, 306
 Stevens Institute of Technology, 248
 Stevenson, Sara Y., 351
 Stewart, John Lammey, 50, 294
 Stillé, Alfred, 273
 ——, Charles J. (Provost 1868-1880): achievements, 257, 279; admission to Board meetings, 279; appointment as Provost, 257; attempted reforms, 276-77, 279, 281-82, 286, 309; background, 257; characteristics, 276, 280; criticism of University organization, 278-82, 286; devotion to task, 276; elective system, 276-77; encouragement of Music Department, 266; inaugural, 277; interest in Scientific School, 264, 277; limitation of powers, 269, 279-81, 374; move to West Philadelphia, 261, 263, 273, 277, 314; relations with Trustees, 278-82, 367; resignation, 281-82, 292, 367; teacher, 277, 304
 Strawbridge, George, 251

Stuart, Gilbert, 12
 Student aid, *see* Scholarships
 Students: age, 55, 86, 161, 179, 187, 198, 200, 249-50, 259, 406; athletics, vi, 54, 94, 312-17, 320, 383, 421, 423-24; behavior, 74, 95, 161, 188, 190-92, 222, 225-26, 280-81, 421-22; extracurricular activities, vi, 87-96, 258, 265, 334, 340-42, 344, 408, 422, 431-33; fraternities, 380, 408, 432; health, 424; Houston Club, 342; length of course, 82, 84-85, 186, 194, 216, 259, 269-75, 290, 302, 325, 346; military training, 249-55, 379-81, 390; music, 408, 432; plays, 87, 92-93, 138-39, 267, 322, 408, 431-32; publications, vii, 199, 363, 378, 431; religious interests, 340, 342, 433; restaurant facilities, 365; student government, 415; tuition and living costs, 55, 59, 71, 145, 158, 211-12, 214-15, 266, 271-72, 275-76, 316, 349
 Students' Army Training Corps, 380-81, 433
 Subscriptions, *see* Gifts
 Summer School, 346-49, 358, 382, 401
 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, 415
 Supreme Court (U.S.), 91, 158, 200
 Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania, 91, 124, 129, 139-40, 165, 231
 Surgeons Hall, *see* Anatomical Hall
 Surgery, 101, 136, 275
 Surgical research, 409
 Surveying, 240
 Swarthmore College, 301
 Swedish settlers in Philadelphia, 4, 14, 257
 Swimming, 94
 Syms, Anna W., 378
 Syng, Philip, 30
 Syracuse University, 311

 Taverns in Colonial Philadelphia, 7
 Taxes, 226
 Teacher Training, Board of, 417
 Teachers' courses, 345-49, 358, 382, 400-04, 406-07, 417
 Tener, John K., 377
 Tennent, Gilbert, 26
 Tennis, 424
 Tenure of office, 76-77, 291-94, 368-71
 Term Trustees, 417, 420
 Terrestrial magnetism, 223
 Theory and Practice of Medicine, 89, 136, 202
 Thespians, 431
 Thompson, C. S., v, 194
 ——, Robert Ellis, 264-65, 289, 291-94
 Thomson, Charles, 73, 80
 ——, J. G., 190, 193-94
 Thorpe, Francis N., viii, 50, 288, 343
 Ticknor, George, 219, 224
 Tilghman, James, 189
 ——, Tench, 119
 Tilton, James, 136
 Tories, 13, 54, 88, 90, 112, 117, 119-20, 145, 148, 151, 212
 Toronto, University of, 266
 Torreziani, 99
 Towne, John Henry, 264, 277
 Towne Scientific School, *see* Scientific School
 Toxicology, 272
 Track athletics, 314-17
 "Training for leadership," 384-87, 391
 Transportation courses, 295
 Treasurer, 58, 59, 161, 194-95, 237, 414, 423
 Treasury, Secretary of (U.S.), 199, 200, 232
 Trego, Charles B., 239-41
 Triangle, 344
 Trinity College (Dublin), 241
 Truman, James, 268
 Trustees (Academy): aristocratic tinge, 30; Charter of the Academy (1753), 39, 43; Charter of the College (1755), 43; choice of location, 34; constitutional provisions, 30-31; dominant powers, 33-34; engagement of William Smith, 43; opening of Charity School, 38; organization in 1749, 30, 48; purchase of "New Building," 35-36, 45, 173-74; religious affiliations, 32; transfer of trust (1749), 35-36, 45, 50, 125, 165, 173
 —— (College of Philadelphia): aristocratic tendencies, 30, 104, 111, 123, 131, 148; attendance at meetings, 161; building activities, 55-56; criticism by Franklin, 154-55, 171; dissolution (1779), 124, 129, 131, 146, 148, 231; election of University Trustees, 165; family relationships, 108; financial problems, 58-61, 65-71; inauguration of Medical School, 100; interest in curriculum, 74-76, 78-79, 157-59; lotteries, 60-61, 65, 78; new

Charter, 43-44; charter members (1789), 151; oath of allegiance to Crown, 44, 122-23, 165; position in Revolution, 115, 117-20; religious complexion, 122-23; report to Legislature (1779), 121-22; restoration (1789), 129, 146-52; restriction of honorary degrees, 91; support of Provost Smith, 106, 108, 169; suspension of powers, 120; Tory members, 119-20

Trustees ("New Building"): erection of "New Building," 25; petition for sale of property, 27; plan for Charity School, 23, 38, 41, 174; purchase of Fourth and Arch streets tract, 24-25; religious aspects, 24, 35-36, 172; transfer of trust to Academy Board, 35-36, 38, 41, 45, 50, 125, 165, 173-74; "Trustees for Land and Building," 24, 26; "Trustees for Uses," 24, 26-27

— (University): academic freedom, 367-71; admission of women, 305-08, 403; affiliated boards, 351-52, 357, 399; Alumni Trustees, 320-21, 383, 393; appeal for Federal land grant, 254-56; appeals for state aid, 183-84, 203, 214, 372, 392; appointment of President, 420; Associate Trustees, 417-18; Board of Graduate Education and Research, 412-13; building activities, 181-82, 213, 228-30, 261-63, 270, 340, 343, 403; Committee on Ways and Means, 329; Committee on University Policy, 391-92; connection with Charity School, 304; conservatism, 231, 259, 278, 343, 366; constituent boards, 419; control over curriculum, 168-69, 178, 184-85, 277, 366-67; decision on date of founding, 49-51; devotion to task, 178, 189-90, 206, 281, 349; Executive Board, 419; expansion of curriculum, 234-35, 239, 244-48, 266-70, 288, 296, 302, 316, 351; financial problems, 182-84, 194-95, 203-07, 226, 277-78, 399; first meeting, 165-66; interest in student activities, 197-98, 313, 340; Leonard Wood election, 388-90; Library supervision, 322; Life Trustees, 417; modification of powers, 285-88, 366-67, 371, 414; nepotism, 189, 214, 225; plans for botanical school, 203-07, 303; relations with Faculty, 178, 184-85, 188-90, 192-94, 219-22, 280, 282, 291-94, 366-71, 390; relations with Provost, 177-78, 184-90, 192-93, 219-21, 225, 227, 278-82, 285-88, 329, 362; relations with School of Medicine, 136, 210, 212-15, 228, 260, 271, 274-75, 279; reorganization (1928-1931), 416-17, 420; social prestige, 189, 194; statutory provisions, 164; supremacy, 278-82, 285-86, 291-93; Term Trustees, 417; Valley Forge problem, 394-97; war activities, 249, 251, 380

Trustees (University of the State of Pennsylvania): ambitious plans, 132-35; appointment, 124; choice of Provost and Faculty, 132-34; composition, 124, 129-30; conflict with Provost Smith, 131-32, 146-50; final report, 160-61; financial problems, 144-46, 160-61; Franklin's connection, 124, 130, 140; honors to Paine, Washington, Mifflin, 137, 159-60, letter to King of France, 141; plans for union with College, 162-65; political affiliations, 129-32, 135, 146; proposed curriculum, 131-35; reduction of powers, 146-50; reorganization of Medical School, 135-37; representatives on united Board, 165

Tuberculosis studies, 327, 357, 409

Tuition fees, 31, 55, 59, 71, 211-12, 214-15, 272, 275-76, 316, 349, 399

Tutors, 31, 38, 58, 73-74, 91, 96, 145, 161, 186, 193

Tyndale, John, 299

Tyndale, Hector, Fellowship, 299

Undergraduate Schools, Vice-President in Charge of, 416, 421

Undergraduates, *see* Students

Union College, 227, 232, 245

Union Library Catalogue, 427

Union of College and the University of the State of Pennsylvania (1791), 162-69, 176, 180, 182-85, 200, 202, 207-08, 285, 372

Unitarians, 177

United States Adjutant General, 381

— Attorney-General, 198

— Coast Survey, 223

— Congress, 159

— Governor-General of the Philippines, 389-90

— House of Representatives, 294

— Military Academy, 222-23, 244, 249, 252

— Mint, 238, 263

United States National Research Council, 411
 —— Naval Academy, 244, 249
 —— Post Office, 278
 —— President, 159, 181, 199, 200, 202, 208, 251, 361, 389
 —— Secretary of Commerce, 411
 —— Secretary of the Treasury, 199, 200, 232
 —— Secretary of War, 389
 —— Supreme Court, 91, 158, 200
 —— Vice-President, 159
 —— War Department, 379-80
 "University," use of title, 96, 104, 123, 163-64, 180, 258-59
 University Barge Club, 232, 314
 University Extension, *see* Extension courses
 University Fund, v, 398-400, 407, 415, 418
 University Hospital, 262, 269, 273-75, 278, 287, 310, 326-28, 351, 353, 373, 376, 424
 University Light Infantry, 250
University Magazine, 431
 University Museum, 187, 323-24, 334, 351-53, 373-74
 "University of Philadelphia," 96
 University of the State of Pennsylvania: Commencements and functions, 137-44; curriculum, 131-35, 184; enrollment, 137, 159-60; Faculty, 132-35; financial problems, 144-46, 160-61; hospitality to outside groups, 142-44; identification as a state university, 120, 124, 129-31, 133, 146, 149, 160-61, 166, 392; loss of support, 146-50; Medical School, 135-37, 156, 159; origin (Act of 1779), 123-25, 231; period 1779-1781, 151-53, 159-61, 180; political background, 120-25, 146, 161; religious character, 122-24; state support, 123, 125, 372; Trustees, *see* Trustees, University of the State of Pennsylvania; union with College, 162-69, 176, 180, 182-85, 200, 202, 207-08, 285, 372
 "University Papers," vii
 University Press, 415
 Ur of the Chaldees expedition, 350
 Uranian Society, 142
 Vacations, 346
 Valley Forge, 180, 394-97, 419
 Valley Forge Board, 396, 419
 Van Gelder, Garrett, 193-94
 Vergennes, Charles Gravier, Comte de, 141
 Vermont, University of, 224
 Veterinary Hospital, 251, 310, 373
 Veterinary Medicine, School of: administration, 310, 365; admission of women, 402; animal pathology, 427; enrollment, 310, 358; Faculty, vi; founding, 309-10; history, vi; Hospital, 251, 310, 373; state support, 310, 373
 Veterinary science, 205
 Vethake, Henry (Provost 1854-1859), 222, 246
 Vice-President of the United States, 159
 Vice-Presidents, List of, 436
 Vice-Provost, 43, 44, 80, 86, 103, 120, 123, 131, 133-34, 140, 145, 151, 155, 167, 178, 182, 185-86, 211, 220, 222, 281, 335-36, 361, 363, 376, 415-16, 420
 Vice-Provost in Charge of Administration, 415-16
 —— Faculty Personnel and Relations, 415
 —— Medical Departments, 416
 —— Undergraduate Departments, 415-16
 Vice-Provosts, List of, 435
 Vidal, Stephen, 14
 Virginia, University of, 193, 234
 Vocational courses, 239-42, 254-56, 261, 295, 406
 Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, 98-99
 Wales, Princess Dowager of, 65
 Walker, Robert J., 199, 232
 "War aims" courses, 380
 War Department, 379-80
 Ward, Henry Galbraith, 321
 Washington, George, 91, 119, 137, 139-41, 159, 181
 ——, Martha, 159
 Washington, University of, 402
 Washington College, 149, 157, 177
 Wayland, Francis, 227, 233
 Wayne, Anthony, 119
 Ways and Means Committee, 61, 329, 334
 Webster, Daniel, 200
 ——, Noah, 143-44, 405
 Weeks, John W., 389
 Weiberg, Casparus, 130
 Weightman Hall, 317
 Weiser, Conrad, 40
 Welfare Committee, 384-85

Welsh, John, 278-79, 292-93, 306, 343
 Welsh Professorship of History and
 English Literature, 292-93
 West, Benjamin, 89, 93
 West Indies, financial aid to College,
 68-69, 180
 West Philadelphia location of University, 237, 261-63, 265, 311, 314, 343,
 355-58, 373, 396, 428, 430, 432
 West Point, 222-23, 244, 249, 252
 Wetherill, Charles M., 277
 Weygandt, Cornelius, viii
 Wharton, Joseph, 288, 290
 —, Thomas, 230
Wharton News, 431
 Wharton School: administration, 289,
 295, 365, 417; admission of women,
 306, 408; alumni, 294, 419; degrees,
 291, 386; enrollment, 295, 358, 382;
 Evening School, 347-49; Faculty, 289-
 95, 297, 306, 339; founding, 288, 301,
 310; history (1881-1931), vi; industrial
 research, 410-13; Institute of
 Local and State Government, 426;
 nature of course, 247, 288, 290-91,
 294-95, 367, 401; Nearing case, 369-
 71; *Wharton News*, 431
 White, Andrew D., 277
 —, J. William, 313, 316-17
 —, William, 89, 130, 133, 148, 189,
 229-30
 White, Bishop, Dormitory, 344
 Whitefield, George, 11, 17-27, 35, 38,
 59, 89, 118, 172
Whitefield's Journal, 11, 18-20, 22
 Wickersham, George W., 391, 394, 398
 —, J. P., 389
 Wilkes-Barre Extension Courses, 348
 William and Mary, College of, 46, 133,
 141-42, 164, 177, 202-03, 227, 233
 William Penn Charter School, 13
 Williamson, Hugh, 79, 80, 112
 Williamsport Extension Courses, 348
 Willing, Thomas, 115, 130
 Willits, Joseph, 410
 Wilson, James, 74, 78, 91, 148, 158-59
 —, William Irvine, 211-12
 —, William P., 301
 Wilson Dormitory, 355
 Wisconsin, University of, 391
 Wistar, Caspar, 156, 166, 202-03, 208,
 210-15
 Wistar Institute, 334, 357-58, 427
 Witherspoon, John, 164
 Witmer, Lightner, 294, 354, 371, 401
 Wittenberg College, 361
 Women, admission of, 279, 297-98, 300-
 09, 338, 345-49, 384-85, 400-08, 421,
 425
 Women, College of Liberal Arts for,
 403, 407-08, 425
 Women's athletics, 424
 Women's Medical College, 305
 Wood, George Bacon, vii, 205, 268, 272-
 73, 303, 430
 —, H. C., 305
 —, Leonard, 363, 388-90
 Woodhouse, James, 213-15
 "Woodlands," 88, 261
 Woodruff, Clinton Rogers, 294
 Wood's Hole Marine Laboratory, 302
 Wooley, Edmund, 6, 24
 Woolman, Henry N., 395-97
 Wordsworth, William, 224, 243
 World War, 378-82, 410, 433
 Wrestling, 94
 Writing School, 72, 78-80
 Wylie, Samuel Brown, 220, 223
 Yale, Elihu, 27
 Yale System, 399
 Yale University, 34, 46, 60, 80, 85, 143,
 177, 179, 191, 210, 219, 233-34, 257,
 262, 279, 285, 297
 Yale University Press, 415
 Yellow fever, 185, 207-08, 213
 Yocom, A. D., 401
 York Academy, 360
 Yorktown, 139
 Young, James T., 295
 Young Men's Christian Association, 433
 Zelosophic Society, 199, 265, 432
 Zinzendorf, Nikolaus Ludwig, Count
 von, 26
 Zoölogical Building, 334, 356
 Zoölogical Garden, 318
 Zoölogy, 83, 204-05, 272, 300-02
 Zoöpraxoscope, 318

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



124 920

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY